

# Exact Channel Synthesis

Lei Yu and Vincent Y. F. Tan, *Senior Member, IEEE*

**Abstract**—We consider the exact channel synthesis problem. This problem concerns the determination of the minimum amount of information required to create exact correlation remotely when there is a certain rate of randomness shared by two terminals. This problem generalizes an existing approximate version, in which the generated joint distribution is required to be close to a target distribution under the total variation (TV) distance measure (instead being exactly equal to the target distribution). We provide single-letter inner and outer bounds on the admissible region of the shared randomness rate and the communication rate for the exact channel synthesis problem. These two bounds coincide for doubly symmetric binary sources. We observe that for such sources, the admissible rate region for exact channel synthesis is strictly included in that for the TV-approximate version. We also extend the exact and TV-approximate channel synthesis problems to sources with countably infinite alphabets and continuous sources; the latter includes Gaussian sources. As by-products, lemmas concerning soft-covering under Rényi divergence measures are derived.

**Index Terms**—Exact synthesis, Communication complexity of correlation, Channel synthesis, Rényi divergence, Approximate synthesis, Soft-covering

## I. INTRODUCTION

How much information is required to create correlation remotely? This problem, illustrated in Fig. 1 and termed *distributed channel synthesis* (or communication complexity of correlation) was studied in [1]–[5]. The exact channel synthesis refers to the problem of determining the minimum communication rate required to generate a bivariate source  $\{(X^n, Y^n)\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$  with  $X^n$  generated at the encoder and  $Y^n$  generated at the decoder such that the induced joint distribution  $P_{X^n Y^n}$  exactly equals  $\pi_{X^n Y^n}^n$  for all  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ . In contrast, the total variation (TV) approximate version of the problem only requires that the TV distance between  $P_{X^n Y^n}$  and  $\pi_{X^n Y^n}^n$  vanishes asymptotically. Bennett et al. [1] studied both exact and TV-approximate syntheses of a target channel. At almost the same time, Winter [2] studied TV-approximate synthesis of a target channel. However in both these two works, the authors assumed that unlimited shared randomness

is available at the encoder and decoder. They showed that the minimum communication rates for both exact and TV-approximate syntheses are equal to the mutual information  $I(X; Y)$  in which  $(X, Y) \sim \pi_{XY}$ . Cuff [3] and Bennett et al. [4] investigated the tradeoff between the communication rate and the rate of randomness shared by the encoder and decoder in the TV-approximate simulation problem. Harsha et al. [5] used a rejection sampling scheme to study the one-shot version of exact simulation for discrete  $(X, Y)$ . They showed that the number of bits of the shared randomness can be limited to  $O(\log \log |\mathcal{X}| + \log |\mathcal{Y}|)$  if the expected description length is increased by  $O(\log(I(X; Y) + 1) + \log \log |\mathcal{Y}|)$  bits from the lower bound  $I(X; Y)$ . Li and El Gamal [6] showed that if the expected description length is increased by  $\log(I(X; Y) + 1) + 5$  bits from  $I(X; Y)$ , then the number of bits of the shared randomness can be upper bounded by  $\log(|\mathcal{X}|(|\mathcal{Y}| - 1) + 2)$ . Recently, the present authors [7] considered the exact channel synthesis problem with no shared randomness and completely characterized the optimal communication rate for the doubly symmetric binary source (DSBS). For the DSBS, the present authors observed that exact channel synthesis requires a strictly larger communication rate than that required for the TV-approximate version. The tradeoff between the communication rate and the shared randomness rate for the exact channel synthesis problem has not been studied, except for the limiting case of unlimited shared randomness which was studied by Bennett et al. [1], the limiting case of no shared randomness which was studied by Kumar, Li, and El Gamal [8] and the present authors [7], as well as the special case of the symmetric binary erasure source (SBES) which was studied by Kumar, Li, and El Gamal [8]. In this paper, we study this problem and make progress on it.

As shown by Bennett et al. [1], when there exists unlimited shared randomness available at the encoder and decoder, there exists a scheme to synthesize a target channel if and only if the asymptotic communication rate is at least the mutual information  $I(X; Y)$ . If the sequence of communication rates is restricted to approach the optimal/minimum rate  $I(X; Y)$  asymptotically as  $n \rightarrow \infty$  (i.e., there is no penalty on the asymptotic communication rate), then what is the minimum amount of shared randomness required to realize exact synthesis? Bennett et al. [4] conjectured that an exponential number of bits (and hence an infinite rate) of shared randomness is necessary. For brevity, we term this conjecture as the BDHSW (Bennett-Devetak-Harrow-Shor-Winter) conjecture. Harsha et al. [5] (as well as Li and El Gamal [6]) disproved this conjecture for  $(X, Y)$  with finite alphabets, and showed that for this case a finite rate (i.e., linear number of bits) of shared randomness is sufficient to realize exact synthesis with no penalty on the asymptotic communication rate. More precisely, Harsha et al.'s one-shot result implies that the rate of shared

This work was supported by a Singapore National Research Foundation (NRF) National Cybersecurity R&D Grant (R-263-000-C74-281 and NRF2015NCR-NCR003-006) and a Singapore Ministry of Education Tier 2 Grant (R-263-000-C83-112). The first author was also supported by a National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) under Grant (61631017). This paper was presented in part at the 2019 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT).

L. Yu is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore (NUS), Singapore 117583 (e-mail: leiyu@nus.edu.sg). V. Y. F. Tan is with the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Department of Mathematics, NUS, Singapore 119076 (e-mail: vtan@nus.edu.sg).

Communicated by A. Gohari, Associate Editor for Shannon Theory.

Copyright (c) 2019 IEEE. Personal use of this material is permitted. However, permission to use this material for any other purposes must be obtained from the IEEE by sending a request to pubs-permissions@ieee.org.

randomness can be upper bounded by  $\log |\mathcal{Y}|$ . In this paper, we improve this bound to  $H(Y|X)$  and show that our bound is sharp for the DSBS. We also show that for jointly Gaussian  $(X, Y)$ , any finite rate of shared randomness cannot realize exact synthesis when there is no penalty on the asymptotic communication rate  $I(X; Y)$ .

When there is no shared randomness, the channel synthesis problem reduces to the common information problem. The latter concerns determining the amount of common randomness required to simulate two correlated sources in a distributed fashion. The KL-approximate version of such a problem was first studied by Wyner [9], who used the normalized relative entropy (Kullback-Leibler (KL) divergence) to measure the approximation level (discrepancy) between the simulated joint distribution and the joint distribution of the original correlated sources. Recently, the present authors [10], [11] generalized Wyner’s result such that the approximation level is measured in terms of the Rényi divergence, thus introducing the notion of Rényi common information. Kumar, Li, and El Gamal [8] considered a variable-length exact version of Wyner’s common information. In their study, in addition to allowing variable-length codes, they also required the generated source  $(X^n, Y^n) \sim \pi_{XY}^n$  exactly. For such an exact synthesis problem, the authors posed an open question as to whether there exists a bivariate source for which the exact common information is strictly larger than Wyner’s. This question was answered in the affirmative by the present authors recently [7]. In [7], the present authors completely characterized the exact common information for the DSBS, and showed that for this source, the exact common information is strictly larger than Wyner’s common information.

Besides the works mentioned above, local TV-approximate simulation of a channel was studied by Steinberg and Verdú [12]; TV-approximate simulation of a “bidirectional” channel via interactive communication was studied by Yassaee, Gohari, and Aref [13]; Both the exact and TV-approximate versions of the simulation of a channel over another noisy channel were studied by Haddadpour, Yassaee, Beigi, Gohari, and Aref [14]. In particular, [14] addressed the case of exact simulation of a binary symmetric channel over a binary erasure channel. The relationship between the problem of exact channel simulation over another channel and the problem of zero-error capacity was studied by Cubitt, Leung, Matthews, and Winter [15].

### A. Main Contributions

Our contributions are as follows:

- First we consider channels with finite input and output alphabets. We provide a multi-letter characterization on the tradeoff between or the admissible region of communication rate and shared randomness rate for exact channel synthesis. Using this multi-letter characterization, we derive single-letter inner and outer bounds for the admissible rate region. The inner bound implies that shared randomness with rate  $H(Y|X)$  (or a potentially smaller rate given in (64)) suffices to realize exact channel synthesis, even when the sequence of communication rates is constrained to approach the lowest possible one

$I(X; Y)$  asymptotically. This sharpens Harsha et al.’s upper bound  $\log |\mathcal{Y}|$ .

- When specialized to the DSBS, the inner and outer bounds coincide. This implies that the admissible rate region for exact synthesis of DSBS is completely characterized. Similar to the no shared randomness case [7], when there is shared randomness, the admissible rate region for exact synthesis is still strictly included in that for TV-approximate synthesis given by Cuff [3].
- We extend the exact and TV-approximate channel synthesis problems to the synthesis of discrete or continuous channels. In particular, we provide bounds for jointly Gaussian sources.
- Concerning proof techniques, we leverage a technique known as mixture decomposition (or the splitting technique), which was previously used in [8], [16]–[20]. However, in this paper (as well as in [7]), we combine it with distribution truncation techniques to analyze sources with countably infinite alphabets. We also combine the mixture decomposition technique with truncation, discretization, and Li and El Gamal’s dyadic decomposition technique [21] to analyze continuous sources. Furthermore, as by-products of our analyses, various lemmas that may be of independent interest are derived, e.g., the “chain rule for coupling” lemma, the (distributed and centralized) Rényi-covering lemmas, the log-concavity invariance lemma, etc.

### B. Notations

We use  $P_X$  to denote the probability measure (distribution) of a random variable  $X$  on an alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$ . For brevity, we also use  $P_X$  to denote the corresponding probability mass function (pmf) for discrete distributions, and the corresponding probability density function (pdf) for continuous distributions. This will also be denoted as  $P(x)$  (when the random variable  $X$  is clear from the context). We also use  $\pi_X, \tilde{P}_X, \hat{P}_X$  and  $Q_X$  to denote various probability distributions with alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$ . The set of probability measures on  $\mathcal{X}$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ , and the set of conditional probability measures on  $\mathcal{Y}$  given a variable in  $\mathcal{X}$  is denoted as  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}|\mathcal{X}) := \{P_{Y|X} : P_{Y|X}(\cdot|x) \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{Y}), x \in \mathcal{X}\}$ . Furthermore, the support of a distribution  $P \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$  is denoted as  $\text{supp}(P) = \{x \in \mathcal{X} : P(x) > 0\}$ .

The TV distance between two probability mass functions  $P$  and  $Q$  with a common alphabet  $\mathcal{X}$  is defined as

$$|P - Q| := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} |P(x) - Q(x)|. \quad (1)$$

We use  $T_{x^n}(x) := \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n 1\{x_i = x\}$  to denote the type (empirical distribution) of a sequence  $x^n$ ,  $T_X$  and  $V_{Y|X}$  to respectively denote a type of sequences in  $\mathcal{X}^n$  and a conditional type of sequences in  $\mathcal{Y}^n$  (given a sequence  $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n$ ). For a type  $T_X$ , the type class (set of sequences having the same type  $T_X$ ) is denoted by  $\mathcal{T}_{T_X}$ . For a conditional type  $V_{Y|X}$  and a sequence  $x^n$ , the  $V_{Y|X}$ -shell of  $x^n$  (the set of  $y^n$  sequences having the same conditional type  $V_{Y|X}$  given  $x^n$ ) is denoted by




Fig. 1. The exact channel synthesis problem. We would like to design the code  $(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n})$  such that the induced conditional distribution  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  satisfies  $P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n$ .

$\mathcal{T}_{V_{Y|X}}(x^n)$ . For brevity, sometimes we use  $T(x, y)$  to denote the joint distributions  $T(x)V(y|x)$  or  $T(y)V(x|y)$ .

The  $\epsilon$ -strongly and  $\epsilon$ -weakly typical sets [22]–[25] of  $P_X$  are respectively denoted as

$$\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X) := \left\{ x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n : \left| T_{x^n}(x) - P_X(x) \right| \leq \epsilon P_X(x), \forall x \in \mathcal{X} \right\}, \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X) := \left\{ x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n : \left| -\frac{1}{n} \log P_X^n(x^n) - H(X) \right| \leq \epsilon \right\}. \quad (3)$$

Note that  $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$  only applies to sources with finite alphabets. For  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$ , if  $P_X$  is an absolutely continuous distribution, in (3),  $P_X^n(x^n)$  and  $H(X)$  are respectively replaced with the corresponding pdf and differential entropy. The corresponding jointly typical sets are defined similarly. The conditionally  $\epsilon$ -strongly typical set of  $P_{XY}$  is denoted as

$$\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_{XY}|x^n) := \left\{ y^n \in \mathcal{Y}^n : (x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_{XY}) \right\}, \quad (4)$$

and the conditionally  $\epsilon$ -weakly typical set is defined similarly. For brevity, sometimes we denote  $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_X)$  as  $\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$  and  $\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ , respectively.

Fix distributions  $P_X, Q_X \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X})$ . The *relative entropy* and the *Rényi divergence of order  $\infty$*  are respectively defined as

$$D(P_X \| Q_X) := \sum_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} P_X(x) \log \frac{P_X(x)}{Q_X(x)} \quad (5)$$

$$D_\infty(P_X \| Q_X) := \log \sup_{x \in \text{supp}(P_X)} \frac{P_X(x)}{Q_X(x)}, \quad (6)$$

and the conditional versions are respectively defined as

$$D(P_{Y|X} \| Q_{Y|X} | P_X) := D(P_X P_{Y|X} \| P_X Q_{Y|X}) \quad (7)$$

$$D_\infty(P_{Y|X} \| Q_{Y|X} | P_X) := D_\infty(P_X P_{Y|X} \| P_X Q_{Y|X}), \quad (8)$$

where the summations in (5) and (6) are taken over the elements in  $\text{supp}(P_X)$ . Throughout,  $\log$  and  $\exp$  are to the natural base  $e$ .

Denote the coupling set of  $(P_X, P_Y)$  as

$$C(P_X, P_Y) := \{Q_{XY} \in \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}) : Q_X = P_X, Q_Y = P_Y\}. \quad (9)$$

For  $i, j \in \mathbb{Z}$ , and  $i \leq j$ , we define  $[i : j] := \{i, i+1, \dots, j\}$ . Given a number  $a \in [0, 1]$ , we define  $\bar{a} = 1 - a$ . For any real number  $c$  and any set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , we define  $c\mathcal{A} := \{ca : a \in \mathcal{A}\}$ . For a set  $\mathcal{A} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^n$ , we use  $\text{cl } \mathcal{A}$  and  $\text{int } \mathcal{A}$  to denote the closure

and interior of  $\mathcal{A}$  respectively. For a sequence  $\{\mathcal{A}_n\}$  of subsets of a space,  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{A}_n := \bigcap_{n \geq 1} \bigcup_{j \geq n} \mathcal{A}_j$ .

We say that a sequence of real numbers  $(a_n)$  converges to a finite real value  $a$  (at least) exponentially fast if there exist a real number  $b > 1$  and a positive integer  $N$  such that  $|a_n - a| \leq b^{-n}$  for all  $n \geq N$ . We say that a sequence of real numbers  $(a_n)$  converges to a finite real value  $a$  (at least) doubly exponentially fast if there exist real numbers  $b, c > 1$  and a positive integer  $N$  such that  $|a_n - a| \leq b^{-c^n}$  for all  $n \geq N$ .

For two distributions  $P$  and  $Q$  defined on the same measurable space, we use  $P \ll Q$  to denote that  $P$  is absolutely continuous with respect to  $Q$ . If  $P \ll Q$ , we use  $\frac{dP}{dQ}$  to denote the Radon–Nikodym derivative of  $P$  with respect to  $Q$ .

## II. PROBLEM FORMULATION

Consider the distributed source simulation setup depicted in Fig. 1. A sender and a receiver share a uniformly distributed source of randomness<sup>1</sup>  $K_n \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{K}_n)$ ,  $\mathcal{K}_n := [1 : e^{nR_0}]$ . The sender has access to a memoryless source  $X^n \sim \pi_X^n$  that is independent of  $K_n$ , and wants to transmit information about the correlation between correlated sources  $(X^n, Y^n) \sim \pi_{XY}^n$  to the receiver. Here we assume  $\text{supp}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$  but not necessarily  $\text{supp}(\pi_{XY}) = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Given the shared randomness and the correlation information from the sender, the receiver generates a memoryless source  $Y^n \sim \pi_{Y|X}^n(\cdot|X^n)$ . Specifically, given  $X^n$  and  $K_n$ , the sender generates a “message” (i.e., a discrete random variable)  $W_n$  by a random mapping  $P_{W_n|X^n K_n}$ , and then sends it to the receiver error free. Upon accessing to  $K_n$  and receiving  $W_n$ , the receiver generates a source  $Y^n$  by a random mapping  $P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}$ . Now we would like to determine the minimum amount of communication such that the joint distribution of  $(X^n, Y^n)$  is  $\pi_{XY}^n$ . Next we provide a precise formulation of this problem.

Define  $\{0, 1\}^* := \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \{0, 1\}^n$  as the set of finite-length strings of symbols from a binary alphabet  $\{0, 1\}$ . Denote the alphabet of the random variable  $W_n$  as  $\mathcal{W}_n$ , which is a countable set. Consider a set of (more precisely, a sequence of) prefix-free codes [23],  $\mathbf{f} = \{f_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_n\}$ , which consists of  $f_k : \mathcal{W}_n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*$ ,  $k \in \mathcal{K}_n$ . Then for each pair  $(w, k) \in \mathcal{W}_n \times \mathcal{K}_n$  and the set of codes  $\mathbf{f}$ , let  $\ell_{\mathbf{f}}(w|k)$  denote the length of the codeword  $f_k(w)$ , where  $f_k$  is the  $k$ -th component of  $\mathbf{f}$ .

**Definition 1.** The expected codeword length  $L_{\mathbf{f}}$  for compressing the random variable  $W_n$  given  $K_n$  by a prefix-free code

<sup>1</sup>For simplicity, we assume that  $e^{nR}$  and similar expressions are integers.

set  $\mathbf{f}$  is denoted as  $L_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n) := \mathbb{E}[\ell_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n)]$ . Here the expectation is taken respect to the random variables  $(W_n, K_n)$ .

**Definition 2.** A variable-length  $(n, R_0, R)$ -code consists of a pair of random mappings  $P_{W_n|X^n K_n} : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{K}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_n$ ,  $P_{Y^n|W_n K_n} : \mathcal{W}_n \times \mathcal{K}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^n$  and a set of prefix-free codes  $\mathbf{f} = \{f_k : \mathcal{W}_n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^*\}_{k \in \mathcal{K}_n}$  for some countable set  $\mathcal{W}_n$  such that<sup>2</sup> the expected codeword length for  $(W_n, K_n)$  satisfies  $L_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n)/n \leq R$ , where  $(W_n, K_n)$  is distributed as

$$P_{W_n K_n}(w, k) = \sum_{x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{K}_n|} \pi_X^n(x^n) P_{W_n|X^n K_n}(w|x^n, k). \quad (10)$$

By using such synthesis codes,  $W_n$  can be transmitted from the sender to the receiver without error. Hence the generated (or synthesized) distribution for such setting is

$$P_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n) := \sum_{(w,k) \in \mathcal{W}_n \times \mathcal{K}_n} \frac{1}{|\mathcal{K}_n|} \times P_{W_n|X^n K_n}(w|x^n, k) P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}(y^n|w, k), \quad (11)$$

which is required to be equal to  $\pi_{Y^n|X^n}$  exactly. It is worth noting that under the assumption  $K_n \sim \text{Unif}(\mathcal{K}_n)$ , the synthesized channel  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  is determined only by the random mapping pair  $(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n})$ , and does not depend on the source distribution  $\pi_X^n$ . However, the code rate induced by a given synthesis code indeed depends on  $\pi_X^n$ . Given the shared randomness rate  $R_0$ , the minimum asymptotic communication rate required to ensure  $P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y^n|X^n}$  for all  $n \geq 1$  is  $\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} L_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n)$ .

**Definition 3.** The admissible region of shared randomness rate and communication rate for the exact channel synthesis problem is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) := \text{cl} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 : \\ \exists \{\text{variable-length } (n, R_0, R^{(n)}) \text{ code}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y^n|X^n}, \forall n, \\ R \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} R^{(n)} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (12)$$

Observe that  $L_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n) = \mathbb{E}_{K_n} \mathbb{E}_{W_n|K_n}[\ell_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n)]$ . Hence to minimize the expected codeword length  $L_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n)$ , it suffices to minimize  $\mathbb{E}[\ell_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n)|K_n = k]$  for each  $k$ . For each  $k \in \mathcal{K}_n$ , we use an optimal prefix-free code (e.g., a Huffman code)  $f_k$  to compress  $W_n$ . The resulting expected codeword length given  $K_n = k$  satisfies  $H(W_n|K_n = k) \leq \mathbb{E}_{W_n|K_n=k}[\ell_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|k)] < H(W_n|K_n = k) + 1$  [23, Theorem 5.4.1]. Hence for a set of optimal prefix-free codes  $\mathbf{f}^* = \{f_k : k \in \mathcal{K}_n\}$ , the expected codeword length also satisfies

$$H(W_n|K_n) \leq L_{\mathbf{f}^*}(W_n|K_n) < H(W_n|K_n) + 1. \quad (13)$$

<sup>2</sup>Our results in this paper still hold if we replace  $L_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|K_n)/n \leq R$  with a stronger constraint  $L_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|k)/n \leq R$  for all  $k$ , where  $L_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|k) := \mathbb{E}_{W_n|K_n=k}[\ell_{\mathbf{f}}(W_n|k)]$ .

Consequently,

$$\frac{1}{n} L_{\mathbf{f}^*}(W_n|K_n) - \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \rightarrow 0 \text{ as } n \rightarrow \infty. \quad (14)$$

Based on such an argument, we provide the following multi-letter characterization for  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$  as follows. The proof is given in Appendix A.

**Proposition 1.** We have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = \text{cl} \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) : \exists (P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y^n|X^n}, \\ R \geq \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (15)$$

This multi-letter characterization does not depend on the set of prefix-free codes  $\mathbf{f}$ . Hence a variable-length synthesis code can be represented by a pair of random mappings  $(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n})$ , where the dependence on  $\mathbf{f}$  is omitted.

### III. MAIN RESULTS FOR DISTRIBUTIONS WITH FINITE ALPHABETS

In this section, we assume that  $\pi_{XY}$  has a finite alphabet. We first introduce a new quantity, the maximal cross-entropy, use it to provide a multi-letter expression for the exact channel synthesis problem. Based on such an expression, we then derive single-letter inner and outer bounds. Finally, we solve the exact synthesis problem for the DSBS.

#### A. Maximal Cross-Entropy

**Definition 4.** For a distribution tuple  $(P_X, P_Y, \pi_{XY})$ , define the maximal cross-entropy over couplings in  $\mathcal{C}(P_X, P_Y)$  as

$$\mathcal{H}(P_X, P_Y \| \pi_{XY}) := \max_{P_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_X, P_Y)} \sum_{x,y} P_{XY}(x,y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)}. \quad (16)$$

*Remark 1.* The concept of maximal (relative) cross-entropy can be easily generalized to distributions with arbitrary alphabets by rewriting the RHS of (16) as  $\sup_{P_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_X, P_Y)} -\mathbb{E}_{P_{XY}} \log \frac{d\pi}{d\mu}(X, Y)$ , where  $\mu$  denotes a reference measure such that  $\pi \ll \mu$ .

The coupling set and the maximal cross-entropy have the following intuitive interpretations. Assume the alphabets  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are finite. Consider a joint distribution  $\pi_{XY}$ , a pair of distributions  $(P_X, P_Y)$ , and a sequence of pairs of types

$$\left\{ \left( T_X^{(n)}, T_Y^{(n)} \right) \in \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{X}) \times \mathcal{P}_n(\mathcal{Y}) \right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \quad (17)$$

such that  $\left( T_X^{(n)}, T_Y^{(n)} \right) \rightarrow (P_X, P_Y)$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Then the sets of the joint types of  $(x^n, y^n)$  such that  $T_{x^n} = T_X^{(n)}, T_{y^n} = T_Y^{(n)}$  satisfy

$$\text{cl} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left\{ T_{x^n, y^n} : \exists (x^n, y^n) \text{ s.t. } T_{x^n} = T_X^{(n)}, T_{y^n} = T_Y^{(n)} \right\} = \mathcal{C}(P_X, P_Y). \quad (18)$$

The exponents of probabilities  $\pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n)$  such that  $T_{x^n} = T_X^{(n)}$ ,  $T_{y^n} = T_Y^{(n)}$  satisfy that

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{\substack{(x^n, y^n): \\ T_{x^n} = T_X^{(n)}, \\ T_{y^n} = T_Y^{(n)}}} -\frac{1}{n} \log \pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n) \\ = \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \min_{\substack{(x^n, y^n): \\ T_{x^n} = T_X^{(n)}, \\ T_{y^n} = T_Y^{(n)}}} \sum_{x, y} T_{x^n, y^n}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \quad (19)$$

$$= \mathcal{H}(P_X, P_Y \| \pi_{XY}). \quad (20)$$

Furthermore, the following fundamental properties on maximal cross-entropy hold. The proof is provided in Appendix B.

**Proposition 2.** *Assume the alphabets  $\mathcal{X}$  and  $\mathcal{Y}$  are finite. Let  $\pi_{XY}$  be a joint distribution with marginals  $\pi_X$  and  $\pi_Y$ . a) Then we have*

$$\mathcal{H}(\pi_X, \pi_Y \| \pi_{XY}) \geq H(\pi_{XY}), \quad (21)$$

where equality in (21) holds if and only if  $\pi_{XY} = \pi_X \pi_Y$ . b) Moreover, assume  $\text{supp}(\pi_{XY}) = \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Then for any distributions  $P_X$  and  $P_Y$  such that  $\text{supp}(P_X) = \mathcal{X}$ ,  $\text{supp}(P_Y) = \mathcal{Y}$ , we have

$$\mathcal{H}(P_X, P_Y \| \pi_{XY}) \geq \sum_{x, y} P_X(x) P_Y(y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)}, \quad (22)$$

where equality in (22) holds if and only if  $\pi_{XY} = \pi_X \pi_Y$ .

**Example 1 (DSBS).** Consider a DSBS  $(X, Y)$  with distribution

$$\pi_{XY} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0 & \beta_0 \\ \beta_0 & \alpha_0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (23)$$

where  $\alpha_0 = \frac{1-p}{2}$ ,  $\beta_0 = \frac{p}{2}$  with  $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . Here w.l.o.g., we restrict  $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ , since otherwise, we can set  $X \oplus 1$  to  $X$  and the same conclusions follow. Consider

$$P_X = (\alpha, \bar{\alpha}), \quad P_Y = (\beta, \bar{\beta}) \quad (24)$$

for some  $\alpha, \beta \in [0, 1]$ . Then

$$\mathcal{H}(P_X, P_Y \| \pi_{XY}) \\ = \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + (\min\{\alpha, \bar{\beta}\} + \min\{\bar{\alpha}, \beta\}) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \quad (25)$$

$$= \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + \min\{\alpha + \beta, \bar{\alpha} + \bar{\beta}\} \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}. \quad (26)$$

Furthermore, if  $P_X = \pi_X$ ,  $P_Y = \pi_Y$  (i.e.,  $\alpha = \beta = \frac{1}{2}$ ), then

$$\mathcal{H}(\pi_X, \pi_Y \| \pi_{XY}) = \log \frac{1}{\beta_0}. \quad (27)$$

In contrast,

$$H(\pi_{XY}) = 2\alpha_0 \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + 2\beta_0 \log \frac{1}{\beta_0} \quad (28)$$

$$\leq \mathcal{H}(\pi_X, \pi_Y \| \pi_{XY}), \quad (29)$$

where equality in (29) holds if and only if  $p = \frac{1}{2}$ .

**Example 2 (Gaussian Source).** Consider a bivariate Gaussian source  $\pi_{XY} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{XY})$  where  $\Sigma_{XY} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  with correlation coefficient  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ . Here without loss of any generality, we assume the correlation coefficient  $\rho$  between  $(X, Y)$  is nonnegative; otherwise, we can set  $-X$  to  $X$ . Consider

$$P_X = \mathcal{N}(\mu_1, \alpha), \quad P_Y = \mathcal{N}(\mu_2, \beta) \quad (30)$$

for some  $\alpha, \beta > 0$ . Then<sup>3</sup>

$$\mathcal{H}(P_X, P_Y \| \pi_{XY}) \\ = \log(2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}) + \frac{1 - \rho \min_{P_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_X, P_Y)} \mathbb{E}[XY]}{1 - \rho^2} \quad (31)$$

$$= \log(2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}) + \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} - \frac{\rho}{1-\rho^2} \\ \times \left( \min_{P_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_X, P_Y)} \mathbb{E}[(X - \mu_1)(Y - \mu_2)] + \mu_1 \mu_2 \right) \quad (32)$$

$$= \log(2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}) + \frac{1 + \rho(\sqrt{\alpha\beta} - \mu_1\mu_2)}{1 - \rho^2}, \quad (33)$$

where (33) follows by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality. Furthermore, if  $P_X = \pi_X$ ,  $P_Y = \pi_Y$  (i.e.,  $\mu_1 = \mu_2 = 0, \alpha = \beta = 1$ ), then

$$\mathcal{H}(\pi_X, \pi_Y \| \pi_{XY}) = \log(2\pi\sqrt{1-\rho^2}) + \frac{1}{1-\rho}. \quad (34)$$

In contrast,

$$H(\pi_{XY}) = \log(2\pi e\sqrt{1-\rho^2}) \leq \mathcal{H}(\pi_X, \pi_Y \| \pi_{XY}), \quad (35)$$

where equality holds if and only if  $\rho = 0$ .

## B. Multi-Letter Characterization

Based on the maximal cross-entropy defined above, we characterize the admissible rate region  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$  by using multi-letter expressions. The proof of Theorem 1 is given in Appendix C.

**Theorem 1 (Multi-letter Characterization).** *For a joint distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  defined on a finite alphabet,*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = \text{cl} \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \frac{1}{n} \mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}^n), \quad (36)$$

<sup>3</sup>Here computing  $\min_{P_{XY} \in \mathcal{C}(P_X, P_Y)} \mathbb{E}[XY]$  is equivalent to computing the Wasserstein distance of order 2  $W_2(P_X, P_{Y'}) := \min_{P_{XY'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_X, P_{Y'})} \mathbb{E}[(X - Y')^2]$  where  $Y' := -Y$ . It is well known [26, Example 3.2.14] that for  $P_X, P_{Y'}$  defined on  $\mathbb{R}$ ,  $W_2(P_X, P_{Y'}) = \mathbb{E}[(F_X^{-1}(U) - F_{Y'}^{-1}(U))^2]$ , where  $U$  is a uniform random variable on  $[0, 1]$ , and  $F_X^{-1}(u) := \inf\{x \in \mathbb{R} : F_X(x) \geq u\}$  denotes the generalized inverses of the cumulative distribution functions  $F_X$  of  $P_X$  (and  $F_{Y'}^{-1}(\cdot)$  is defined similarly).

where

$$\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}^n) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) : \exists P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \\ R \geq I(W; X^n), \\ R_0 + R \geq -H(X^n Y^n | W) + \sum_w P(w) \\ \quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X^n|W=w}, P_{Y^n|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}^n) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (37)$$

In our achievability scheme, we apply a mixture decomposition technique (or known as the splitting technique) to construct a variable-length exact synthesis code. This code can be thought of as a mixture of a fixed-length  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate code and a completely lossless code. The  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate code is a fixed-length code which generates a channel  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  that approaches the target channel  $\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n$  asymptotically under the  $\infty$ -Rényi divergence measure. Based on the channel  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$ , we can decompose  $\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n$  as a mixture conditional distribution

$$\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n = e^{-\delta_n} P_{Y^n|X^n} + (1 - e^{-\delta_n}) \widehat{P}_{Y^n|X^n}, \quad (38)$$

for some asymptotically vanishing sequence  $(\delta_n)$  where

$$\widehat{P}_{Y^n|X^n} := \frac{e^{\delta_n} \pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n - P_{Y^n|X^n}}{e^{\delta_n} - 1}. \quad (39)$$

For the “residual channel”  $\widehat{P}_{Y^n|X^n}$ , we adopt a completely lossless code to synthesize it. In this code, upon observing  $x^n$ , the sender generates a random sequence  $Y^n \sim \widehat{P}_{Y^n|X^n=x^n}$ , and then compresses  $Y^n$  by using a prefix-free code with rate  $\leq \log |\mathcal{Y}|$ . In our scheme, the lossless code is invoked with asymmetrically vanishing probability  $1 - e^{-\delta_n}$ , and hence the performance of our scheme is dominated by the  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate code which requires a much lower rate. The  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate code we adopt is a truncated i.i.d. code. For such a code, the codewords are independent and each codeword is drawn according to a distribution  $P_{W^n}$  which is generated by truncating a product distribution  $Q_{W^n}^n$  onto some (strongly) typical set. Truncated i.i.d. codes are rather useful for  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate synthesis (but not for TV-approximate synthesis). This follows from the following argument. Observe that for both  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate synthesis and TV-approximate synthesis,  $X^n \rightarrow W_n K_n \rightarrow Y^n$  forms a Markov chain. Hence given  $(W_n, K_n) = (w, k)$ , the support of  $P_{X^n|W_n K_n}(\cdot|w, k) P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}(\cdot|w, k)$  is a product set, which in turn implies that the support of  $P_{X^n Y^n}$  is the union of a family of product sets. Such a requirement leads to the fact that the support of  $P_{X^n Y^n}$  includes not only a jointly typical set, but also other joint type classes (which is termed by us as the type overflow phenomenon). TV-approximate synthesis only requires the sequences in a typical set to be well-simulated. However,  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate synthesis requires all the sequences in the support of  $P_{X^n Y^n}$  to be well-simulated. Hence type overflow does not affect TV-approximate synthesis, but plays a crucial role for  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate synthesis (or exact synthesis). Truncated i.i.d. coding is an efficient approach to control the possible types of the output sequence of a code (or more precisely, to mitigate

the effects of type overflow). Furthermore, truncated i.i.d. codes have also been used by the present authors [7], [10], [11], [27] to study the Rényi and exact common informations, and by Vellambi and Kliever [20], [28] to study sufficient conditions for the equality of the exact and Wyner’s common informations.

Based on the type overflow argument given above and the intuitive explanation of the maximal cross-entropy given in Subsection III-A, our bounds are easy to comprehend intuitively. For simplicity, we only consider the single-letter expression  $\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY})$ . The first inequality follows from the fact that lossless transmission of the message  $W_n$  requires rate at least  $I(W; X)$ . The second inequality follows from the following argument. The exact channel synthesis requires that there exists a sequence of variable-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  satisfying  $\frac{P_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n)}{\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n(y^n|x^n)} = 1$  for all  $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ . By using the mixture decomposition technique, the exact channel synthesis problem can be relaxed to the  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate synthesis problem, which requires that there exists a sequence of fixed-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  satisfying

$$\frac{\pi_X^n(x^n)}{P_{X^n}(x^n)} = 1 + o(1) \quad (40)$$

for all  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(\pi_X)$  and

$$\frac{P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n, y^n)}{\pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n)} \leq 1 + o(1) \quad (41)$$

for all  $(x^n, y^n) \in \text{supp}(P_{X^n Y^n})$ ; see Lemma 2. The requirement (40) is satisfied, as long as  $R \geq I(W; X)$ . As for the constraint in (41), observe that by using truncated i.i.d. codes, to mitigate the effect of type overflow we can restrict  $(W^n, X^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_{WX})$  and  $(W^n, Y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(P_{WY})$ . Assume that  $M_n$  is the message for  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate synthesis. Roughly speaking, for a given  $R_0$ , a sequence of optimal codes that achieves the minimum asymptotically communication rate satisfies the following “property”: Each pair of output sequences  $(x^n, y^n)$  is only covered by less than  $e^{n\delta}$  codewords for any  $\delta > 0$  (otherwise, the code rate  $R$  can be further reduced). This “property” implies that for sufficiently large  $n$  and sufficiently small  $\epsilon$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & P_{X^n Y^n}(x^n, y^n) \\ & \approx P_{M_n K_n}(m, k) P_{X^n|W}(x^n|w^n(m, k)) P_{Y^n|W}(y^n|w^n(m, k)) \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

$$\approx e^{-n(R+R_0)} e^{-nH(X|W)} e^{-nH(Y|W)}. \quad (43)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} & \min_{(x^n, y^n) \in \text{supp}(P_{X^n Y^n})} \pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n) \\ & \approx \min_{(w^n, x^n, y^n): T_{w^n x^n} \approx P_{WX}, T_{w^n y^n} \approx P_{WY}} \pi_{XY}^n(x^n, y^n) \\ & \approx e^{-n \sum_w P_W(w) \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY})}. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Substituting (43) and (45) into (41), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & R_0 + R \\ & \gtrsim -H(XY|W) + \sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

This is the second constraint in (37).

### C. Single-letter Bounds

Define

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) : \exists P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \\ R \geq I(W; X), \\ R_0 + R \geq I(W; XY) \end{array} \right\}, \quad (47)$$

$$\mathcal{R}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY}) := \mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) : \exists P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \\ R \geq I(W; X), \\ R_0 + R \geq -H(XY|W) + \sum_w P(w) \\ \quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}) \end{array} \right\}, \quad (49)$$

and

$$\mathcal{R}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY}) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) : \exists P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \\ R \geq I(W; X), \\ R_0 + R \geq \Gamma(P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}, \pi_{XY}) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (50)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma(P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}, \pi_{XY}) \\ & := -H(XY|W) + \min_{Q_{WW'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_W, P_W)} \sum_{w, w'} Q(w, w') \\ & \quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'} \| \pi_{XY}). \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

For  $(X, Y)$  with finite alphabets, Cuff [3] showed that  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  is equal to the admissible rate region for the TV-approximate channel synthesis problem (see the definition in Subsection IV-A). For (47) and (49), it suffices to restrict the alphabet size of  $W$  such that  $|W| \leq |\mathcal{X}||\mathcal{Y}| + 1$ .

By utilizing the multi-letter expression in Theorem 1, we provide single-letter inner and outer bounds for the admissible rate region. The proof of Theorem 2 is given in Appendix D.

**Theorem 2 (Single-letter Bounds).** *For a joint distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  defined on a finite alphabet,*

$$\mathcal{R}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY}) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}). \quad (52)$$

*Remark 2.* Note that the only difference between the inner bound  $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY})$  and outer bound  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  is that in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$ , the sum-rate is lower bounded by  $I(W; XY)$ , but in  $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY})$ , the sum-rate is lower bounded by  $-H(XY|W) + \sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY})$ . By the definition of maximal cross-entropy,

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}) \\ & \geq \sum_w P(w) \sum_{x, y} P_{X|W}(x|w) P_{Y|W}(y|w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

$$= H(\pi_{XY}). \quad (54)$$

Hence we have

$$\begin{aligned} & -H(XY|W) + \sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}) \\ & \geq I(W; XY). \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

That is, our lower bound on the sum rate is at least as large as Cuff's; see (47).

*Remark 3.* The only difference between the inner bound  $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY})$  and outer bound  $\mathcal{R}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY})$  is that in  $\mathcal{R}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY})$ , the minimization is taken over all couplings of  $(P_W, P_W)$ , but in  $\mathcal{R}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY})$ , it is not (or equivalently, the expectation in (49) can be seen as being taken under the equality coupling of  $(P_W, P_W)$ , namely  $P_W(w)1\{w' = w\}$ ).

*Remark 4.* It can be shown that the sum rate bound in  $\mathcal{R}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY})$

$$\begin{aligned} & -H(XY|W) + \min_{Q_{WW'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_W, P_W)} \sum_{w, w'} Q_{WW'}(w, w') \\ & \quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'} \| \pi_{XY}) \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & = \min_{Q_{WW'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_W, P_W)} \sum_{w, w'} Q_{WW'}(w, w') \max_{\substack{C(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'}) \\ Q_{XY} \in C(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'})}} \\ & \quad \sum_{x, y} Q(x, y) \log \frac{P_{X|W}(x|w) P_{Y|W}(y|w')}{\pi(x, y)} \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \geq \min_{Q_{WW'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_W, P_W)} \sum_{w, w'} Q_{WW'}(w, w') \\ & \quad \times D(P_{X|W=w} P_{Y|W=w'} \| \pi_{XY}) \\ & \geq 0. \end{aligned} \quad (58)$$

Moreover, there exists some distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  such that  $\mathcal{R}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY}) \subsetneq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  (e.g., the DSBS; see the next subsection). However, it is difficult to compare (56) to  $I(XY; W)$  for all  $\pi_{XY}$ . As yet, we have not found any distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  such that  $\mathcal{R}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY}) \setminus \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) \neq \emptyset$ .

Define

$$R^*(R_0) := \inf_{(R, R_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})} R \quad (60)$$

$$R_0^*(R) := \inf_{(R, R_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})} R_0. \quad (61)$$

Then from the inner and outer bounds in Theorem 2, we have that

$$R^*(\infty) = I_\pi(X; Y). \quad (62)$$

This is consistent with Bennett et al.'s observation [1, Theorem 2]. That is, when there exists unlimited shared randomness available at the encoder and decoder, a target channel can be synthesized by some scheme if and only if the minimum asymptotic communication rate is larger than or equal to the mutual information  $I_\pi(X; Y)$  between  $(X, Y) \sim \pi_{XY}$ . Moreover, the authors of [1] also showed that an exponential number of bits (infinite rate) of shared randomness suffices to realize such synthesis. Bennett et al. [4, pp. 2939] conjectured that when communication rates are restricted to approach to the optimal communication rate  $I_\pi(X; Y)$  asymptotically as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , an exponential amount of shared randomness is also necessary to realize exact synthesis. (As mentioned in the introduction, this is referred to as the BDHSW conjecture).

Harsha et al. [5] (as well as Li and El Gamal [6]) disproved this conjecture for discrete  $(X, Y)$  with finite alphabets, and showed that for this case shared randomness with rate  $\log |\mathcal{Y}|$  is sufficient to realize such synthesis. Now we also focus on this limiting case (in which the asymptotic optimal communication rate is used), and investigate the minimum amount of shared randomness required for this case. We have the following upper bound.

$$R_0^*(I_\pi(X; Y)) = \inf_{(I_\pi(X; Y), R_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})} R_0 \quad (63)$$

$$\leq \min_{P_{W|Y}: X \rightarrow W \rightarrow Y} -H(X) - H(Y|W) + \sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}) \quad (64)$$

$$\leq H_\pi(Y|X), \quad (65)$$

where (64) follows from the inner bound in Theorem 2, and (65) follows by setting  $W = Y$ . The upper bound is, in general, tighter than Harsha et al.'s bound of  $\log |\mathcal{Y}|$ . In the next subsection, we will show that the upper bound in (65) is tight for the DSBS. In Bennett et al.'s scheme [4], the shared randomness is used to generate a random codebook. However, in our scheme, as described after Theorem 1, we apply a mixture decomposition technique to construct a variable-length exact synthesis code, which is a mixture of a fixed-length  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate code and a completely lossless code. As mentioned previously, the performance of our scheme primarily depends on the performance of the  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate code which requires a much lower rate of shared randomness than Bennett et al.'s scheme. Furthermore, in Harsha et al.'s code [5] (as well as Li and El Gamal's [6]), it is required that  $Y^n$  and  $(X^n, K_n)$  are related as  $Y^n = f(X^n, K_n)$  for some deterministic function  $f$ . However, in our scheme, such a requirement is not necessary. Hence it is not unexpected that our bound is tighter than those presented in [5], [6].

We also have the following lower bound.

$$R_0^*(I_\pi(X; Y)) \geq \min_{P_{W|Y}: X \rightarrow W \rightarrow Y} -H(X) - H(Y|W) \quad (66)$$

$$+ \min_{Q_{WW'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_W, P_{W'})} \sum_{w, w'} Q_{WW'}(w, w') \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'} \| \pi_{XY}), \quad (67)$$

where (67) follows from the outer bound in Theorem 2. Note that  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  is the admissible rate region for the TV-approximate synthesis problem [29], and it is also an outer bound on  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$ . On the other hand, for TV-approximate synthesis, the corresponding minimum shared randomness rate  $\tilde{R}_0^*(I_\pi(X; Y)) := \inf_{(I_\pi(X; Y), R_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})} R_0$  is equal to the *necessary conditional entropy* [29]

$$H_\pi(Y \uparrow X) := \min_{f: X \rightarrow f(Y) \rightarrow Y} H(f(Y)|X). \quad (68)$$

Hence,  $R_0^*(I_\pi(X; Y))$  is also lower bounded by  $H_\pi(Y \uparrow X)$ .

#### D. Doubly Symmetric Binary Source

A DSBS is a source  $(X, Y)$  with distribution

$$\pi_{XY} := \begin{bmatrix} \alpha_0 & \beta_0 \\ \beta_0 & \alpha_0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (69)$$

where  $\alpha_0 = \frac{1-p}{2}, \beta_0 = \frac{p}{2}$  with  $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ . This is equivalent to  $X \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})$  and  $Y = X \oplus E$  with  $E \sim \text{Bern}(p)$  independent of  $X$ ; or  $X = W \oplus A$  and  $Y = W \oplus B$  with  $W \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})$ ,  $A \sim \text{Bern}(a)$ , and  $B \sim \text{Bern}(b)$  mutually independent, where  $a \in (0, p), ab + \bar{a}\bar{b} = p$ . Here w.l.o.g., we restrict  $p \in [0, \frac{1}{2}]$ , since otherwise, we can set  $X \oplus 1$  to  $X$ .

By utilizing the inner and outer bounds in Theorem 2, we completely characterize the admissible rate region for the DSBS. The proof of Theorem 3 is given in Appendix E.

**Theorem 3.** For a DSBS  $(X, Y)$  with distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  given in (69),

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R, R_0) : a \in [0, p], b := \frac{p-a}{1-2a}, \\ R \geq 1 - H_2(a), \\ R_0 + R \geq \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} + (a+b) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \\ \quad - H_2(a) - H_2(b) \end{array} \right\}, \quad (70)$$

where  $H_2(x) := -x \log x - (1-x) \log(1-x)$  denotes the binary entropy function.

Following steps similar to the proof of Theorem 3, one can show that for the DSBS, the admissible rate region for TV-approximate channel synthesis is

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R, R_0) : a \in [0, p], b := \frac{p-a}{1-2a}, \\ R \geq 1 - H_2(a), \\ R_0 + R \geq 1 + H_2(p) - H_2(a) - H_2(b) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (71)$$

Obviously,  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$  and  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY})$  only differ in the final inequalities. It is easy to check that for  $p \in (0, \frac{1}{2})$ ,  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$  is strictly included in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY})$ . Intuitively, this interesting consequence is caused by the type overflow phenomenon, which was described in detail after Theorem 1. Such a result also confirms that type overflow does not affect TV-approximate synthesis, but it does affect exact synthesis.

Furthermore, letting  $R = 1 - H_2(p)$  in  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$ , we get  $a = p, b = 0$ . Hence  $R_0 \geq H_2(p)$ . That is, the upper bound in (65) is tight for the DSBS.

The admissible regions for exact synthesis and TV-approximate synthesis for the DSBS are illustrated in Fig. 2.

#### IV. EXTENSION TO MORE GENERAL DISTRIBUTIONS

##### A. TV-Approximate Channel Synthesis

We extend the TV-approximate channel synthesis problem to the case of more general distributions. In contrast to the exact synthesis problem, in the TV-approximate synthesis problem, the communication rate is measured by the exponent of the alphabet size of  $W_n$ , rather than the normalized conditional entropy of  $W_n$  given  $K_n$ . In addition, the generated (or synthesized) distribution  $\pi_X^n P_{Y_n|X^n}$  is required to approach






Fig. 2. Illustrations of the admissible regions for exact synthesis (given in (70)) and TV-approximate synthesis (given in (71)) for the DSBS  $(X, Y)$  in which  $X \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})$  and  $Y = X \oplus E$  with  $E \sim \text{Bern}(0.2)$  (i.e.,  $p = 0.2$ ) independent of  $X$ . The admissible regions for exact and TV-approximate syntheses respectively correspond to the regions above the two curves. In this figure,  $C_W$  and  $C_E$  respectively denote Wyner's [9] and the exact common informations [7], [8] between  $(X, Y)$ , which also respectively correspond to the minimum  $R$ 's for TV-approximate and exact syntheses when  $R_0 = 0$ .

$\pi_{XY}^n$  asymptotically under the TV distance, instead of being exactly equal to  $\pi_{XY}^n$ .

**Definition 5.** A fixed-length  $(n, R_0, R)$ -code consists of a pair of random mappings  $P_{W_n|X^n K_n} : \mathcal{X}^n \times \mathcal{K}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{W}_n, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n} : \mathcal{W}_n \times \mathcal{K}_n \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}^n$  for some countable set  $\mathcal{W}_n$  such that  $\frac{1}{n} \log |\mathcal{W}_n| \leq R$ .

**Definition 6.** The admissible region of shared randomness rate and communication rate for the TV-approximate channel synthesis problem is defined as

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY}) := \text{cl} \left\{ (R_0, R) : \exists \{\text{fixed-length } (n, R_0, R) \text{ code}\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{ s.t. } \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} |\pi_{X^n}^n P_{Y^n|X^n} - \pi_{XY}^n| = 0 \right\}. \quad (72)$$

For  $\pi_{XY}$  with a finite alphabet,  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY})$  was completely characterized by Cuff [3] and Bennett et al. [4]. For an arbitrary distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  defined on an arbitrary measurable space, the inner bound in the following theorem was proven by Cuff [3, Theorem II.1] (since as mentioned by the author, [3, Theorem II.1] also holds for “general” distributions), and the outer bound in the following theorem follows by Cuff's converse proof of [3, Theorem II.1].

**Theorem 4 (TV-approximate Channel Synthesis).** [3] *For a source  $(X, Y)$  with an arbitrary distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  (defined on the product of two arbitrary measurable spaces),*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}), \quad (73)$$

where<sup>4</sup>

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) : \exists P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \\ I(W; X) \text{ and } I(W; XY) \text{ exist,} \\ R \geq I(W; X), \\ R_0 + R \geq I(W; XY) \end{array} \right\}, \quad (74)$$

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R, R_0) : \exists P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \text{ s.t.} \\ |P_{XY} - \pi_{XY}| \leq \epsilon, \\ I(W; X) \text{ and } I(W; XY) \text{ exist,} \\ R \geq I(W; X), \\ R_0 + R \geq I(W; XY) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (75)$$

Obviously,  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$ . We do not know if they are equal in general. However, for sources with finite alphabets,  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  was proven by Cuff

<sup>4</sup>For an arbitrary distribution  $P_{WX}$ , the mutual information  $I(W; X)$  exists if  $P_{WX} \ll P_W P_X$  and the integral  $\int_{\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{X}} \left| \log \frac{dP_{WX}}{d(P_W P_X)} \right| dP_{WX} < +\infty$ . The mutual information always exists for distributions with finite alphabets but does not always exist for other distributions. Hence for an arbitrary distribution  $\pi_{XY}$ , we modify the definition of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  given in (47) to the one given in (74). For brevity, we use the same notation for these two definitions. This is consistent since the  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  defined in (74) reduces to the one defined in (47) when the distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  has a finite alphabet (by standard cardinality bounding techniques, for this case, it suffices to consider distributions  $P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}$  with finite alphabets).

[3] and Bennett et al. [4]. In the following, we show that  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) = \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  also holds for sources with countably infinite alphabets and some class of continuous sources.

**Corollary 1.** *Let  $(X, Y)$  be a source with distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  defined on the product of two countably infinite alphabets. Assume  $H(\pi_{XY})$  exists (and hence is finite). Then we have*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY}) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}). \quad (76)$$

**Corollary 2.** *Assume  $\pi_{XY}$  is an absolutely continuous distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  such that its pdf<sup>5</sup>  $\pi_{XY}$  is log-concave<sup>6</sup> and differentiable. Assume  $I(X; Y)$  exists (and hence is finite). For  $d > 0$ , define*

$$L_d := \sup_{(x,y) \in [-d,d]^2} \frac{\left| \frac{\partial \pi_{XY}}{\partial x}(x,y) \right| + \left| \frac{\partial \pi_{XY}}{\partial y}(x,y) \right|}{\pi_{XY}(x,y)}, \quad (77)$$

and

$$\epsilon_d := 1 - \pi_{XY}([-d,d]^2). \quad (78)$$

If there exists a function  $\Delta(d)$  such that<sup>7</sup>  $\Delta(d) = de^{-o_+}(\frac{1}{\epsilon_d})$  and  $\Delta(d) = o_+((dL_d)^{-\alpha})$  for some  $\alpha > 1$  as  $d \rightarrow \infty$ , then

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV}}(\pi_{XY}) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}). \quad (79)$$

*Proofs of Corollary 1 and Corollary 2:* The regions  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  and  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  are respectively characterized by the following functions

$$R_{\text{Cuff}}^*(R_0) := \inf_{(R,R_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})} R \quad (80)$$

$$= \inf_{\substack{P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}: \\ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}}} \max \{I(W; XY) - R_0, I(W; X)\}, \quad (81)$$

$$\tilde{R}_{\text{Cuff}}^*(R_0) := \inf_{(R,R_0) \in \tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})} R \quad (82)$$

$$= \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{\substack{P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}: \\ |P_{XY} - \pi_{XY}| \leq \epsilon}} \max \{I(W; XY) - R_0, I(W; X)\}. \quad (83)$$

Hence to prove that

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}), \quad (84)$$

we only need to show that

$$R_{\text{Cuff}}^*(R_0) \leq \tilde{R}_{\text{Cuff}}^*(R_0). \quad (85)$$

<sup>5</sup>For brevity, we use the same notation  $\pi_{XY}$  to denote both an absolutely continuous distribution and the corresponding pdf.

<sup>6</sup>A pdf  $\pi_{XY}$  is log-concave if  $\log \pi_{XY}$  is concave.

<sup>7</sup>Here  $o_+(g(d))$  denotes a positive function  $f(d)$  such that  $f(d) = o(g(d))$  (i.e.,  $\lim_{d \rightarrow \infty} \frac{f(d)}{g(d)} = 0$ ).

In [7, Corollaries 2 and 3], we applied techniques involving truncation, mixture decomposition, discretization, and dyadic decomposition (studied in [21]) to show that<sup>8</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}: P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}} I(W; XY) \\ & \leq \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \inf_{P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}: |P_{XY} - \pi_{XY}| \leq \epsilon} I(W; XY). \end{aligned} \quad (86)$$

The difference between (85) and (86) is only the objective functions. Following similar steps to the proofs of [7, Corollaries 2 and 3], one can show (85). ■

It is easy to verify that any bivariate Gaussian source with a correlation coefficient  $\rho \in (-1, 1)$  satisfies the conditions given in Corollary 2 [7]. Hence we have the following result. Without loss of any generality, we assume the correlation coefficient  $\rho$  between  $(X, Y)$  is nonnegative; otherwise, we can set  $-X$  to  $X$ .

**Corollary 3.** *For a Gaussian source  $(X, Y)$  with correlation coefficient  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ , we have*

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV,G}}(\pi_{XY}) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}) \quad (87)$$

$$= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R, R_0) : \alpha \in [\rho, 1], \alpha\beta = \rho, \\ R \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1}{1-\alpha^2} \right], \\ R_0 + R \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1-\rho^2}{(1-\alpha^2)(1-\beta^2)} \right] \end{array} \right\}. \quad (88)$$

*Proof:* The equality in (87) follows from Theorem 2 by verifying the assumption holds for Gaussian sources. The equality in (88) can be proven by a similar proof to that of Wyner's common information of Gaussian sources [30], [31, Theorems 2 and 8], and hence the proof is omitted here. ■

## B. Exact Channel Synthesis

1) *Discrete Channels with Countably Infinite Alphabets:* In the proof of Theorem 1, a truncated i.i.d. code was adopted to prove the achievability part. In this ensemble, codewords are i.i.d., each drawn according to a set of truncated distributions, obtained by truncating a set of product distributions into some (strongly) typical sets. For the countably infinite alphabet case, we replace strongly typical sets with unified typical sets [24], [25]. Then we can establish the following result. The proof is omitted.

**Corollary 4.** *Let  $(X, Y)$  be a source with distribution  $\pi_{XY}$  defined on the product of two countably infinite alphabets. We have*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY}) \cap \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}), \quad (89)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  was defined in (47),

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) : \exists P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}, \\ R \geq I(W; X), \\ R_0 + R \geq \Gamma_1(P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}, \pi_{XY}) \end{array} \right\}, \quad (90)$$

<sup>8</sup>More precisely, what we showed is the inequality (86) with the constraint the TV-distance replaced by the relative entropy. However, as mentioned in [7, Theorem 5], the proofs of [7, Corollaries 2 and 3] also apply to the TV-distance case.

and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY}) := \lim_{\epsilon \downarrow 0} \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R, R_0) : \exists P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W} \text{ s.t.} \\ D(P_{XY} \| \pi_{XY}) \leq \epsilon, \\ R \geq I(W; X), \\ R_0 + R \geq \Gamma_2(P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}, \pi_{XY}) \end{array} \right\} \quad D_\infty(P_{Y^n|X^n} \| \pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n | \tilde{\pi}_{X^n}) = o\left(\frac{1}{n + \log L_{\epsilon,n}}\right) \quad (97)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma_1(P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}, \pi_{XY}) \\ & := -H(XY|W) + \sup_{\substack{Q_{XYW}: D(Q_{WX} \| P_{WX}) \leq \epsilon, \\ D(Q_{WY} \| P_{WY}) \leq \epsilon}} \sum_{w,x,y} P(w) \\ & \quad \times Q(x, y|w) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & \Gamma_2(P_W P_{X|W} P_{Y|W}, \pi_{XY}) \\ & := -H(XY|W) + \inf_{Q_{WW'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_W, P_W)} \sum_{w,w'} Q_{WW'}(w, w') \\ & \quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'} \| \pi_{XY}). \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

For the finite alphabet case, since  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{W} \times \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y})$  is compact, we can take  $\epsilon = 0$  in both (90) and (91). This follows by the Bolzano–Weierstrass theorem, i.e., passing to a convergent subsequence of distributions. However, for the countably infinite alphabet case, in general we cannot do this. Furthermore, it may be possible to remove both  $\epsilon$ 's in the optimizations in (90) and (91) by truncating the distributions, transforming them into finite alphabet ones, as in the proof of Corollary [7, Corollary 2]. This will be studied in the future.

2) *Gaussian Sources*: Before considering Gaussian sources, we first consider more general continuous sources which satisfy certain regularity conditions. For such sources, we prove a sufficient condition for exact channel synthesis, which is analogous to Lemma 2. For  $\epsilon > 0$ , define the truncated distribution

$$\tilde{\pi}_{X^n}(x^n) := \frac{\pi_X^n(x^n) \mathbb{1}\{x^n \in \mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)}\}}{\pi_X^n(\mathcal{A}_\epsilon^{(n)})} \text{ for } n \geq 1. \quad (94)$$

**Lemma 1.** *Assume  $\pi_{XY}$  is an absolutely continuous distribution on  $\mathbb{R}^2$  with  $\mathbb{E}[X^2], \mathbb{E}[Y^2] < \infty$ . Without loss of generality, we assume  $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \mathbb{E}[Y^2] = 1$ . Assume  $I(X; Y)$  exists (and hence is finite). Assume for every  $x$ , the pdf  $\pi_{Y|X}(\cdot|x)$  is log-concave and continuously differentiable. For  $\epsilon > 0$  and  $n \in \mathbb{N}$ , define*

$$L_{\epsilon,n} := \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,n}^2} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial y} \log \pi_{Y|X}(y|x) \right|, \quad (95)$$

where<sup>9</sup>

$$\mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,n} := \left\{ x \in \mathbb{R} : |x| \leq \sqrt{n(2+\epsilon)} \right\}. \quad (96)$$

Assume  $\log L_{\epsilon,n}$  is sub-exponential in  $n$  for fixed  $\epsilon$ . Then if there exists a sequence of fixed-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$

<sup>9</sup>In (96), the reason why we choose the number 2 in the bound  $\sqrt{n(2+\epsilon)}$  is because that from  $\mathbb{E}[X^2] = \mathbb{E}[Y^2] = 1$ , we have  $\mathbb{E}[(Y-X)^2] \leq 2$ .

that generates a channel  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  for the source  $X^n \sim \tilde{\pi}_{X^n}$  such that

for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , then there exists a sequence of variable-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  that exactly generates  $\pi_{XY}^n$  (i.e., the sequence of codes generates a channel  $\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n$  for the source  $X^n \sim \pi_{X^n}^n$ ).

*Remark 5.* One important example satisfying the conditions in the lemma above is the bivariate Gaussian source. Consider a bivariate Gaussian source  $\pi_{XY} = \mathcal{N}(0, \Sigma_{XY})$  where  $\Sigma_{XY} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \rho \\ \rho & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  with  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ . That is,

$$Y = \rho X + \sqrt{1 - \rho^2} Z, \quad (98)$$

where  $Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)$  is independent of  $X$ . For this case,

$$L_{\epsilon,n} = \sup_{(x,y) \in \mathcal{L}_{\epsilon,n}^2} \left| \frac{y - \rho x}{1 - \rho^2} \right| = \frac{\sqrt{n(2+\epsilon)}}{1 - \rho}. \quad (99)$$

Hence  $\log L_{\epsilon,n}$  is sub-exponential in  $n$  for fixed  $\epsilon$ . Observe that  $\frac{1}{n + \log L_{\epsilon,n}} \sim \frac{1}{n}$ . Hence if there exists a sequence of fixed-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  that generates  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  such that

$$D_\infty(P_{Y^n|X^n} \| \pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n | \tilde{\pi}_{X^n}) = o\left(\frac{1}{n}\right), \quad (100)$$

then there must exist a sequence of variable-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  that exactly generates  $\pi_{XY}^n$ .

*Proof of Lemma 1:* The proof follows similar ideas as the one of [7, Lemma 2], where the techniques of mixture decomposition, truncation, discretization, and Li and El Gamal's dyadic decomposition [21] were used. However, the difference is that in [7, Lemma 2], we used the mixture decomposition technique to decompose a memoryless correlated source  $\pi_{XY}^n$ , but here we need to decompose a memoryless channel  $\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n$ . To address this problem, we need to combine the proof of [7, Lemma 2] with the one of Lemma 2. We omit the details of the proof for the sake of brevity. ■

Next we prove an inner bound on  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$  for Gaussian sources  $\pi_{XY}$ . Without loss of generality, we assume that the correlation coefficient  $\rho \in [0, 1)$  between  $(X, Y)$  is nonnegative; otherwise, we can set  $-X$  as  $X$ . By substituting  $X = \alpha W + A, Y = \beta W + B, P_W = \mathcal{N}(0, 1), P_{X|W}(\cdot|w) = \mathcal{N}(w, 1 - \alpha^2), P_{Y|W}(\cdot|w) = \mathcal{N}(w, 1 - \beta^2)$  into the inner bound (49), we obtain the following inner bound for Gaussian sources. Although the inner bound (49) is shown for sources with finite alphabets, one can prove an analogous inner bound for the Gaussian case.

**Theorem 5.** *For a Gaussian source  $(X, Y)$  with correlation coefficient  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ , we have*

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{TV,G}}(\pi_{XY}), \quad (101)$$

where  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV,G}}(\pi_{XY})$  is given in (87), and

$$\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R, R_0) : \alpha \in [\rho, 1], \alpha\beta = \rho, \\ R \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1}{1-\alpha^2} \right], \\ R_0 + R \geq \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1-\rho^2}{(1-\alpha^2)(1-\beta^2)} \right] \\ \quad + \frac{\rho\sqrt{(1-\alpha^2)(1-\beta^2)}}{1-\rho^2} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (102)$$

*Proof:* Since Gaussian sources satisfy the regularity conditions given in Lemma 1 (see Remark 5), by Lemma 1 we only need to show that there exists a sequence of fixed-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  that generates  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  satisfying (100). This can be proven by following similar steps to the achievability proof of Theorem 1 (which is for the discrete case); see Appendix C-A. In Appendix C-A, a distributed version and a centralized version of Rényi-covering lemmas are applied. For Gaussian sources, the distributed Rényi-covering lemma was proven in [7, Lemma 13]. Hence we only need to prove a centralized Rényi-covering lemma for Gaussian sources. To this end, we combine the proof of [7, Lemma 13] with that of Lemma 4. We omit the details of the proof. ■

The difference between the inner bound  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY})$  for exact Gaussian synthesis and the admissible region  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV,G}}(\pi_{XY})$  for TV-approximate Gaussian synthesis is similar to that for the DSBS case; see the discussion at the end of Subsection III-D. Furthermore, for the DSBS, our inner bound in Theorem 3 is tight. Hence by the type overflow argument, we conjecture that for Gaussian sources, the inner bound in (101) is also tight.

For a Gaussian source  $(X, Y)$  with correlation coefficient  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ , the mutual information  $I_\pi(X; Y) = \frac{1}{2} \log \left[ \frac{1}{1-\rho^2} \right]$ . Hence for this case, under the condition that communication rates are restricted to approach to  $I_\pi(X; Y)$  asymptotically, the minimum asymptotic rates of shared randomness required for exact synthesis and TV-approximate synthesis satisfy

$$R_0^*(I_\pi(X; Y)) \geq \inf_{(I_\pi(X; Y), R_0) \in \mathcal{R}_{\text{TV,G}}(\pi_{XY})} R_0 \quad (103)$$

$$= \infty. \quad (104)$$

Hence for a Gaussian source  $(X, Y)$ , any finite rate of shared randomness cannot realize exact synthesis or TV-approximate synthesis when there is no penalty on the asymptotic communication rate.

For Gaussian sources, our inner bound  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY})$  in (102) for exact synthesis and the admissible region  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV,G}}(\pi_{XY})$  in (87) for TV-approximate synthesis are illustrated in Fig. 3. The boundary of  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$  lies between between the two curves in the figure.

## V. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this paper, we studied the tradeoff between the shared randomness rate and the communication rate for exact channel synthesis; provided single-letter inner and outer bounds on the admissible rate region for this problem; completely characterized them for the DSBS; and extended these results,

and also existing results for TV-approximate channel synthesis, to discrete sources with countably infinite alphabets and continuous sources (including Gaussian sources). For the DSBS, we observed that the admissible rate region for exact channel synthesis is strictly larger than that for TV-approximate channel synthesis. For Gaussian sources with correlation coefficient  $\rho \in [0, 1)$ , we provided inner and outer bounds on the admissible rate region for exact channel synthesis. Due to the intuitive type overflow argument, we conjecture that the inner bound is tight.

Exact and TV-approximate channel synthesis differ primarily in the following two aspects. First, for TV-approximate synthesis, it does not matter whether one uses a fixed- or variable-length message. In contrast, for exact synthesis, such a distinction is consequential. This is because by the asymptotic equipartition property, i.i.d. copies of a variable-length (nonuniform) message are distributed over a typical set with high probability. Hence by using superblock coding (in which block codes are considered as supersymbols [23]) and truncation techniques [32], [33], a code for TV-approximate synthesis with a variable-length message can be converted into a code for TV-approximate synthesis with a fixed-length message, with the approximation error increasing by an asymptotically vanishing amount. On the other hand, a fixed-length message can be seen as a special case of variable-length message. Hence variable-length TV-approximate synthesis and the fixed-length version are equivalent. That is, they have the same admissible rate region. However, this is not true for the exact synthesis problem. In general, for the exact case, using a fixed-length message will result in a strictly larger admissible rate region. The conversion argument above does not apply to the exact synthesis problem, since increasing the approximation error by an asymptotically vanishing value is not allowed for exact synthesis. Hence by comparing (variable-length) exact synthesis and variable-length TV-approximate synthesis, we know that exact synthesis is strictly more difficult to realize than the TV-approximate version. This leads to requiring larger rates required for exact synthesis. Second, the type overflow phenomenon does not affect TV-approximate synthesis, but indeed plays a critical role for  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate synthesis (or exact synthesis). In distributed simulation problems, random variables are required to form Markov chains. Hence type overflow is unavoidable (at least for the DSBS). Truncated i.i.d. coding is an effective approach to mitigate the effect of type overflow. Hence it is useful for exact synthesis, but not for TV-approximate synthesis.

One may expect our synthesis scheme to be useful in analyzing zero-error coding problems. In this class of problems, the channel to be synthesized is the identity channel. However, our synthesis scheme does not seem to be useful in this case. To enable our synthesis scheme to be applicable to zero-error coding, it is required to find a code with synthesized channel  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  such that

$$D_\infty(P_{Y^n|X^n} \| \pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n | \tilde{\pi}_{X^n}) \rightarrow 0, \quad (105)$$

where  $\tilde{\pi}_{X^n}$  is a truncated version of  $\pi_{X^n}^n$ . For the identity channel  $\pi_{Y|X}$ , this requirement is too strong or restrictive. In fact, by the definition of  $D_\infty$ , it is equivalent to the




Fig. 3. Illustrations of our inner bound  $\tilde{\mathcal{R}}^{(i)}(\pi_{XY})$  in (102) for exact synthesis and the admissible region  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{TV,G}}(\pi_{XY})$  in (87) for TV-approximate synthesis for Gaussian sources with correlation coefficient  $\rho = 0.5$ . The admissible region for TV-approximate synthesis corresponds to the region above the curve with markers “ $\Delta$ ”. The boundary of the admissible region for exact synthesis lies between between the two curves in the figure.

stringent condition that  $P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n$  for every sufficiently large  $n$ . Therefore, such conversion from the exact synthesis problem to the  $\infty$ -Rényi-approximate synthesis problem does not appear to help us to relax the requirement of exact synthesis.

#### APPENDIX A PROOF OF PROPOSITION 1

By using (14), we have that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R_0, R) : \exists \left\{ (P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) \right\}_{n=1}^{\infty} \text{ s.t.} \\ P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n, \forall n \\ R \geq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \end{array} \right\}. \quad (106)$$

Define

$$a := \inf_{\substack{(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) \\ P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n, \forall n}} \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \quad (107)$$

$$b := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) : P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n} \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n). \quad (108)$$

Now we claim that

$$a = b. \quad (109)$$

This is because by definition, for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists a sequence of codes  $\{(Q_{W_n|X^n K_n}, Q_{Y^n|W_n K_n})\}_{n=1}^{\infty}$  such that  $Q_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n$  for all  $n \geq 1$  and

$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_Q(W_n|K_n) \leq a + \epsilon$ . Since in definition of  $b$ , we minimize  $\frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n)$  for each  $n$ , we have

$$\limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_Q(W_n|K_n) \geq b. \quad (110)$$

Therefore,  $b \leq a + \epsilon$ . Since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we have  $b \leq a$ .

On the other hand, by the definition of  $b$ , for any  $\epsilon > 0$ , there exists an integer  $N$  such that for all  $n \geq N$ ,

$$\inf_{\substack{(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) \\ P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n}} \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \leq b + \epsilon. \quad (111)$$

This implies that for each  $n \geq N$ , there exists an  $n$ -length code  $(Q_{W_n|X^n K_n}, Q_{Y^n|W_n K_n})$  such that  $Q_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n$  and  $\frac{1}{n} H_Q(W_n|K_n) \leq b + 2\epsilon$ . Such a sequence of codes satisfies the constraint in (107). Hence  $a \leq \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{n} H_Q(W_n|K_n) \leq b + 2\epsilon$ . Since  $\epsilon > 0$  is arbitrary, we have  $b \geq a$ .

Combining the two points above, we have  $a = b$ . Therefore, we obtain that

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) = \{(R_0, R) : R \geq a\} \quad (112)$$

$$= \{(R_0, R) : R \geq b\} \quad (113)$$

$$= \left\{ (R_0, R) : R \geq \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \inf_{(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) : P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n} \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \right\} \quad (114)$$

$$= \left\{ (R_0, R) : R \geq \inf_{n \geq 1} \inf_{(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) : P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n} \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \right\} \quad (115)$$

$$= \text{cl} \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \left\{ (R_0, R) : R \geq \inf_{\substack{P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n} \\ P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n}} \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \right\} \quad (116)$$

$$= \text{cl} \bigcup_{n \geq 1} \left\{ (R_0, R) : \exists (P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) \text{ s.t.} \right. \\ \left. P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n, \right. \\ \left. R \geq \frac{1}{n} H(W_n|K_n) \right\}, \quad (117)$$

where (114) follows from Fekete's subadditive lemma since  $a_n := \inf_{(P_{W_n|X^n K_n}, P_{Y^n|W_n K_n}) : P_{Y^n|X^n} = \pi_{Y|X}^n} H(W_n|K_n)$  is a subadditive sequence (i.e.,  $a_{m+n} \leq a_m + a_n$ ); (115) follows since the sequence of infima is non-increasing; (116) follows from the definition of the union and infimizations operations; and (117) follows similarly to (109).

## APPENDIX B PROOF OF PROPOSITION 2

Obviously, both (21) and (22) follow directly from the definition of the maximal cross-entropy. Next we consider necessary and sufficient conditions for which the equalities hold. We first consider (21).

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(\pi_X, \pi_Y \| \pi_{XY}) - H(\pi_{XY}) \\ &= \max_{P_{XY} \in C(\pi_X, \pi_Y)} \sum_{x,y} (P(x,y) - \pi(x,y)) \\ & \quad \times \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)} \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

$$\geq \sum_{x,y} (\pi(x)\pi(y) - \pi(x,y)) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)} \quad (119)$$

$$= \sum_{x,y} (\pi(x)\pi(y) - \pi(x,y)) \log \frac{\pi(x)\pi(y)}{\pi(x,y)} \quad (120)$$

$$= D(\pi_X \pi_Y \| \pi_{XY}) + D(\pi_{XY} \| \pi_X \pi_Y) \quad (121)$$

$$\geq 0, \quad (122)$$

where (120) follows since  $\sum_{x,y} (\pi(x)\pi(y) - \pi(x,y)) f(x) = 0$  for any function  $f(x)$ . All the equalities above hold if and only if  $\pi_{XY} = \pi_X \pi_Y$ .

We next consider (22). If  $\pi_{XY} = \pi_X \pi_Y$ , then equality in (22) holds. Next we prove the ‘‘only if’’ part.

Assume  $\mathcal{H}(P_X, P_Y \| \pi_{XY}) = \sum_{x,y} P_X(x)P_Y(y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)}$ . Obviously,  $P_X P_Y \in C(P_X, P_Y)$ . We add a perturbation  $\epsilon \eta(x, y)$  to the coupling  $P_X P_Y$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} \eta(x, y) &:= 1 \{x = x_0, y = y_0\} + 1 \{x = x_1, y = y_1\} \\ & \quad - 1 \{x = x_0, y = y_1\} - 1 \{x = x_1, y = y_0\} \end{aligned} \quad (123)$$

for some  $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{X}, y_0, y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$ . By assumption,  $\text{supp}(\pi_{XY}) = \text{supp}(P_X) \times \text{supp}(P_Y)$ . Hence for sufficiently

small  $\epsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $P_{XY}^{(\epsilon)} := P_X P_Y + \epsilon \eta$  is a distribution. Obviously,  $P_{XY}^{(\epsilon)} \in C(P_X, P_Y)$ . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{H}(P_X, P_Y \| \pi_{XY}) \\ & \geq \sum_{x,y} P_{XY}^{(\epsilon)}(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \end{aligned} \quad (124)$$

$$= \sum_{x,y} P_X(x)P_Y(y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} + \sum_{x,y} \epsilon \eta(x, y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} \quad (125)$$

$$= \sum_{x,y} P_X(x)P_Y(y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x, y)} + \epsilon \log \frac{\pi(x_0, y_1) \pi(x_1, y_0)}{\pi(x_0, y_0) \pi(x_1, y_1)}. \quad (126)$$

Hence

$$\log \frac{\pi(x_0, y_1) \pi(x_1, y_0)}{\pi(x_0, y_0) \pi(x_1, y_1)} = 0, \quad (127)$$

otherwise we can choose  $\epsilon$  such that (126) is strictly larger than 0, which in turn implies  $\mathcal{H}(P_X, P_Y \| \pi_{XY}) > \sum_{x,y} P_X(x)P_Y(y) \log \frac{1}{\pi(x,y)}$ . Since (127) holds for all  $x_0, x_1 \in \mathcal{X}, y_0, y_1 \in \mathcal{Y}$ , by simple algebraic calculations, we have

$$\frac{\pi(x_0, y_1)}{\pi(x_0, y_0)} = \frac{\pi(y_1)}{\pi(y_0)}, \quad (128)$$

and further obtain that

$$\frac{\pi(x_0) - \pi(x_0, y_0)}{\pi(x_0, y_0)} = \frac{1 - \pi(y_0)}{\pi(y_0)}, \quad (129)$$

i.e.,  $\pi(x_0, y_0) = \pi(x_0) \pi(y_0)$  for all  $(x_0, y_0) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{Y}$ . Hence  $\pi_{XY} = \pi_X \pi_Y$ .

## APPENDIX C PROOF OF THEOREM 1

### A. Achievability

Fix  $\epsilon > 0$  and define

$$\tilde{\pi}_{X^n}(x^n) := \frac{\pi_X^n(x^n) 1\{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}\}}{\pi_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)})}, \text{ for } n \geq 1. \quad (130)$$

To show the desired result, we need the following sufficiency result for the exact synthesis, which states that the channel synthesis under the  $\infty$ -Rényi divergence measure implies the exact channel synthesis.

**Lemma 2.** *If there exists a sequence of fixed-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  that generates a channel  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  for a source  $X^n \sim \tilde{\pi}_{X^n}$  such that*

$$D_\infty(P_{Y^n|X^n} \| \pi_{Y^n|X}^n \| \tilde{\pi}_{X^n}) \rightarrow 0, \quad (131)$$

*then there exists a sequence of variable-length codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  that exactly generates  $\pi_{XY}^n$  (i.e., generates a channel  $\pi_{Y^n|X}^n$  for a source  $X^n \sim \pi_X^n$ ).*

*Remark 6.* Here ‘‘fixed-length codes’’ in the condition can be relaxed to ‘‘variable-length codes’’.

*Remark 7.* Since  $\pi_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}) \rightarrow 1$  as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , the condition in (131) is equivalent to that

$$D_\infty(\tilde{\pi}_{X^n} P_{Y^n|X^n} \| \pi_{XY}^n) \rightarrow 0. \quad (132)$$

*Proof:* We apply a technique so-called mixture decomposition to prove Lemma 2, which was previously used in [19], [20], [28]. According to the definition of  $D_\infty$ ,  $D_\infty(P_{Y^n|X^n} \|\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n \tilde{\pi}_{X^n}) \leq \delta$  implies that  $P_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n) \leq e^\delta \pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n(y^n|x^n)$  for all  $(x^n, y^n) \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)} \times \mathcal{Y}^n$ . For  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ , define

$$\hat{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n) := \frac{e^\delta \pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n(y^n|x^n) - P_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n)}{e^\delta - 1}, \quad (133)$$

then obviously,  $\hat{P}_{Y^n|X^n}$  is a conditional distribution. Hence  $\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n$  can be written as a mixture distribution

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n(y^n|x^n) \\ = e^{-\delta} P_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n) + (1 - e^{-\delta}) \hat{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n) \end{aligned} \quad (134)$$

for  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ . The encoder first generates a Bernoulli random variable  $U$  with  $P_U(1) = e^{-\delta}$ , compresses it using 1 bit, and transmits it to the two generators. If  $U = 1$  and  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ , then the encoder and decoder use the synthesis codes (prescribed in the lemma) with rate  $R$  to generate  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$ . If  $U = 0$  and  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ , then the encoder generates  $Y^n|X^n = x^n \sim \hat{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(\cdot|x^n)$ , and uses a variable-length compression code with rate  $\leq \log|\mathcal{Y}|$  to transmit  $Y^n$ . If  $x^n \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ , then the encoder generates  $Y^n|X^n = x^n \sim \pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n(\cdot|x^n)$ , and uses a variable-length compression code with rate  $\leq \log|\mathcal{Y}|$  to transmit  $Y^n$ . The conditional distribution generated by such a mixture code is  $e^{-\delta} P_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n) + (1 - e^{-\delta}) \hat{P}_{Y^n|X^n}(y^n|x^n)$  for  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$  and  $\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n(y^n|x^n)$  for  $x^n \notin \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}$ , i.e.,  $\pi_{Y^n|X^n}^n(y^n|x^n)$  for all  $x^n$ . The total communication rate is no larger than

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}) \left( \frac{1}{n} + e^{-\delta} R + (1 - e^{-\delta}) \log|\mathcal{Y}| \right) \\ + \left( 1 - \pi_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}) \right) \log|\mathcal{Y}|, \end{aligned} \quad (135)$$

which converges to  $R$  upon taking the limit in  $n \rightarrow \infty$  and the limit in  $\delta \rightarrow 0$ . Furthermore, the rate of shared randomness for this mixed code is still  $R_0$ . ■

By Lemma 2, to show the achievability part, we only need to show that there exists  $\epsilon > 0$  and a sequence of synthesis codes with rates  $(R_0, R)$  that generates  $P_{Y^n|X^n}$  such that  $D_\infty(\tilde{\pi}_{X^n} P_{Y^n|X^n} \|\pi_{X^n}^n) \rightarrow 0$ . Next we prove this.

To show the achievability part, we only need to show that the single-letter expression  $\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY})$  satisfies  $\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$ . This is because we can obtain the inner bound  $\frac{1}{n} \mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}^n)$  by substituting  $\pi_{XY} \leftarrow \pi_{XY}^n$  into the single-letter expression.

Assume  $Q_{WXY}$  is a distribution such that  $Q_{WXY} = Q_W Q_{X|W} Q_{Y|W}$ . Similarly as in (130), we define the dis-

tributions<sup>10</sup>

$$\tilde{Q}_{W^n}(w^n) \propto Q_W^n(w^n) 1\{w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_W)\}, \quad (136)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}(x^n|w^n) \propto Q_{X|W}^n(x^n|w^n) \\ \times 1\{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|w^n)\}, \end{aligned} \quad (137)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Q}_{Y^n|W^n}(y^n|w^n) \propto Q_{Y|W}^n(y^n|w^n) \\ \times 1\{y^n \in \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WY}|w^n)\}. \end{aligned} \quad (138)$$

We consider a random codebook  $\mathcal{C}_n = \{W^n(m, k)\}$  with  $W^n(m, k), (m, k) \in \mathcal{M}_n \times \mathcal{K}_n$  drawn independently for different  $(m, k)$ 's and according to the same distribution  $\tilde{Q}_{W^n}$ . Define  $P_{K_n} := \text{Unif}[1 : e^{nR_0}]$ ,  $P_{M_n} := \text{Unif}[1 : e^{nR}]$ . For random mappings  $\tilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}$  and  $\tilde{Q}_{Y^n|W^n}$ , we define

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{Q}_{X^n Y^n | \mathcal{C}_n}(x^n, y^n | \{W^n(m, k)\}) \\ := \sum_{k, m} P_{K_n}(k) P_{M_n}(m) \tilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}(x^n | W^n(m, k)) \\ \times \tilde{Q}_{Y^n|W^n}(y^n | W^n(m, k)), \end{aligned} \quad (139)$$

which is the output distribution induced by the codebook  $\mathcal{C}_n$  in a distributed source simulation system with simulators  $(\tilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}, \tilde{Q}_{Y^n|W^n})$ . For such a distribution, we have following two Rényi-covering lemmas (i.e., soft-covering lemmas under Rényi divergence measures). Lemma 3 is proven in [7, Lemma 6], and the proof of Lemma 4 is provided in Appendix C-A1.

**Lemma 3** (Distributed Rényi-Covering). [7, Lemma 6] *For the random code described above, if*

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 + R > -H_Q(XY|W) \\ + \sum_w Q(w) \mathcal{H}(Q_{X|W=w}, Q_{Y|W=w} \| Q_{XY}), \end{aligned} \quad (140)$$

then there exists some  $\delta, \epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( D_\infty(\hat{Q}_{X^n Y^n | \mathcal{C}_n} \| Q_{XY}^n) \leq e^{-n\delta} \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (141)$$

doubly exponentially fast. Here  $\epsilon$  was used in the definitions of  $\tilde{Q}_{W^n}$ ,  $\tilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}$ , and  $\tilde{Q}_{Y^n|W^n}$  in (136)-(138).

**Lemma 4** (Centralized Rényi-Covering). *Define a truncated product distribution*

$$\tilde{Q}_{X^n}(x^n) := \frac{Q_X^n(x^n) 1\{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}\}}{Q_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)})}. \quad (142)$$

For the random code described above, if

$$R > I_Q(W; X), \quad (143)$$

then there exists some  $\delta, \epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( \begin{aligned} D_\infty(\hat{Q}_{X^n | \mathcal{C}_n} \| Q_X^n | P_{K_n}) \leq e^{-n\delta}, \\ D_\infty(\hat{Q}_{X^n} \| \hat{Q}_{X^n | \mathcal{C}_n} | P_{K_n}) \leq e^{-n\delta} \end{aligned} \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (144)$$

doubly exponentially fast. Here  $\epsilon$  was used in the definitions of  $\tilde{Q}_{X^n}$ ,  $\tilde{Q}_{W^n}$ ,  $\tilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}$ , and  $\tilde{Q}_{Y^n|W^n}$ .

<sup>10</sup>Here  $f(x) \propto g(x)$  denotes that  $f(x)$  is proportional to  $g(x)$ , i.e.,  $f(x) = c \cdot g(x)$  for some constant  $c$ .

*Remark 8.* If  $R_0 = 0$ , then (144) reduces to the conclusion that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( \begin{array}{l} D_\infty(\widehat{Q}_{X^n|C_n} \| Q_X^n) \leq e^{-n\delta}, \\ D_\infty(\widetilde{Q}_{X^n} \| \widehat{Q}_{X^n|C_n}) \leq e^{-n\delta} \end{array} \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (145)$$

doubly exponentially fast. Since the convergence takes place doubly exponentially fast and  $K_n$  only can take exponential number of different values, by the union bound, it can be seen that (144) and (145) are equivalent.

*Remark 9.* Observe that, by definition,  $\text{supp}(\widetilde{Q}_{W^n} \widetilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX})$ . Hence for any codebook  $c$ ,  $\text{supp}(\widehat{Q}_{X^n|C_n=c}) \subseteq \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_X)$ . On the other hand,  $Q_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X)) \rightarrow 1$  exponentially fast. Hence Lemma 4 implies that there exists some  $\delta', \epsilon > 0$  such that with high probability (probabilities approaching to 1 doubly exponentially fast), the codebook  $\mathcal{C}_n$  satisfies that a) for any  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X)$ ,

$$\exp(-e^{-n\delta'}) \leq \frac{\widehat{Q}_{X^n|C_n}(x^n)}{Q_X^n(x^n)} \leq \exp(e^{-n\delta'}); \quad (146)$$

b) for any  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_X) \setminus \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X)$ ,

$$0 \leq \frac{\widehat{Q}_{X^n|C_n}(x^n)}{Q_X^n(x^n)} \leq \exp(e^{-n\delta'}); \quad (147)$$

and c) for any  $x^n \in \mathcal{X}^n \setminus \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_X)$ ,

$$\widehat{Q}_{X^n|C_n}(x^n) = 0. \quad (148)$$

*Remark 10.* It is worth noting that Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 differ in two points. First, Lemma 3 focuses on a distributed setting where  $X^n$  and  $Y^n$  are respectively generated by  $W^n(M_n, K_n)$  through truncated i.i.d. channels  $\widetilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}$  and  $\widetilde{Q}_{Y^n|W^n}$ . However, Lemma 4 focuses on a centralized setting where the output  $X^n$  is generated by  $W^n(M_n, K_n)$  through only one truncated i.i.d. channel  $\widetilde{Q}_{X^n|W^n}$ . Second, in Lemma 3 only the  $\infty$ -Rényi divergence between the real output distribution and the ideal output distribution is considered; while in Lemma 4 both the  $\infty$ -Rényi divergence between the ideal output distribution and the real output distribution and the  $\infty$ -Rényi divergence between the real output distribution and the ideal output distribution are considered.

*Remark 11.* For the i.i.d. channel case (instead of the truncated version), Rényi-covering lemmas were studied in [27, Theorems 2-4].

Lemma 3 and Lemma 4 imply that there exists  $Q_W Q_X | W Q_Y | W$  with  $Q_{XY} = \pi_{XY}$  such that for some  $\delta, \epsilon > 0$ ,

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( \begin{array}{l} D_\infty(\widehat{Q}_{X^n Y^n | c_n} \| \pi_{XY}^n) \leq e^{-n\delta}, \\ D_\infty(\widetilde{\pi}_{X^n} \| \widehat{Q}_{X^n | K_n c_n} | P_{K_n}) \leq e^{-n\delta} \end{array} \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (149)$$

doubly exponentially fast, as long as the rate pair  $(R_0, R)$  is in the interior of  $\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY})$ . Here  $\epsilon$  was used in the definition of  $\widetilde{\pi}_{X^n}$ ; see (130). Hence there exists a sequence of deterministic codebooks  $\{c_n\}$  such that  $D_\infty(\widehat{Q}_{X^n Y^n | c_n=c_n} \| \pi_{XY}^n)$  and  $D_\infty(\widetilde{\pi}_{X^n} \| \widehat{Q}_{X^n | K_n c_n=c_n} | P_{K_n})$  converge to zero exponentially

fast. For such a sequence of deterministic codebooks (under the condition  $\mathcal{C}_n = c_n$ ), define

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{Q}_{M_n K_n X^n Y^n}(m, k, x^n, y^n) & \\ & := P_{K_n}(k) P_{M_n}(m) \widetilde{Q}_{X^n | W^n}(x^n | w^n(m, k)) \\ & \quad \times \widetilde{Q}_{Y^n | W^n}(y^n | w^n(m, k)) \end{aligned} \quad (150)$$

$$= P_{K_n} \widehat{Q}_{X^n | K_n} \widehat{Q}_{M_n | X^n K_n} \widehat{Q}_{Y^n | M_n K_n} \quad (151)$$

and

$$P_{M_n K_n X^n Y^n} := P_{K_n} \widetilde{\pi}_{X^n} \widehat{Q}_{M_n | X^n K_n} \widehat{Q}_{Y^n | M_n K_n}. \quad (152)$$

Now consider a synthesis code  $(\widehat{Q}_{M_n | X^n K_n}, \widehat{Q}_{Y^n | M_n K_n})$ . Obviously,  $P_{M_n K_n X^n Y^n}$  is the distribution induced by such a synthesis code under the condition that the source  $X^n \sim \widetilde{\pi}_{X^n}$ . Next we prove that such a synthesis code (with rates  $(R_0, R)$ ) generates  $P_{Y^n | X^n}$  such that  $D_\infty(P_{X^n Y^n} \| \pi_{XY}^n) \rightarrow 0$ .

Observe

$$\begin{aligned} D_\infty(P_{X^n Y^n} \| \pi_{XY}^n) & \leq D_\infty(P_{X^n Y^n} \| \widehat{Q}_{X^n Y^n}) \\ & \quad + D_\infty(\widehat{Q}_{X^n Y^n} \| \pi_{XY}^n). \end{aligned} \quad (153)$$

By the choice of  $\{c_n\}$ , the second term of the right hand side above converges to zero exponentially. Next we consider the first term.

$$\begin{aligned} D_\infty(P_{X^n Y^n} \| \widehat{Q}_{X^n Y^n}) & \\ & \leq D_\infty(P_{K_n} \widetilde{\pi}_{X^n} \widehat{Q}_{M_n | X^n K_n} \widehat{Q}_{Y^n | M_n K_n} \\ & \quad \| P_{K_n} \widehat{Q}_{X^n | K_n} \widehat{Q}_{M_n | X^n K_n} \widehat{Q}_{Y^n | M_n K_n}) \end{aligned} \quad (154)$$

$$= D_\infty(\widetilde{\pi}_{X^n} \| \widehat{Q}_{X^n | K_n} | P_{K_n}) \quad (155)$$

$$\rightarrow 0 \text{ exponentially fast as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (156)$$

where (156) follows by the choice of  $\{c_n\}$ . Hence

$$D_\infty(P_{X^n Y^n} \| \pi_{XY}^n) = D_\infty(\widetilde{\pi}_{X^n} P_{Y^n | X^n} \| \pi_{XY}^n) \rightarrow 0. \quad (157)$$

By Lemma 2, we obtain the achievability part.

By definition,  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$  is closed. Hence  $\text{int} \mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$  implies  $\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY})$ .

1) *Proof of Lemma 4 :* Setting  $Y$  to be a constant, Lemma 3 implies that there exists some  $\delta > 0$  such that<sup>11</sup>

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( D_\infty(\widehat{Q}_{X^n | K_n c_n} \| Q_X^n | P_{K_n}) \leq e^{-n\delta} \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (158)$$

doubly exponentially fast, as long as

$$R > I_Q(W; X). \quad (159)$$

Next we prove that there exists some  $\delta, \epsilon > 0$  such that

$$\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( D_\infty(\widetilde{Q}_{X^n} \| \widehat{Q}_{X^n | K_n c_n} | P_{K_n}) \leq e^{-n\delta} \right) \rightarrow 1 \quad (160)$$

doubly exponentially fast, as long as

$$R > I_Q(W; X). \quad (161)$$

<sup>11</sup>In fact, Lemma 3 implies that for any  $k \in [1 : e^{nR_0}]$ ,  $\mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( D_\infty(\widehat{Q}_{X^n | c_n, K_n=k} \| Q_X^n) \leq e^{-n\delta} \right) \rightarrow 1$  doubly exponentially fast. However, as mentioned in Remark 8, this is equivalent to (158).



For brevity, in the following we let  $M = e^{nR}$ . According to the definition of the Rényi divergence of order  $\infty$ , we first have

$$\begin{aligned} & e^{-D_\infty(\tilde{\pi}_{X^n} \|\widehat{Q}_{X^n|K_n C_n} | P_{K_n})} \\ &= \min_{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}, k \in [1:e^{nR_0}]} \frac{\widehat{Q}_{X^n|K_n C_n}(x^n|k, \mathcal{C}_n)}{\widehat{Q}_{X^n}(x^n)} \end{aligned} \quad (162)$$

$$= \min_{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}, k \in [1:e^{nR_0}]} \tilde{g}(x^n | \mathcal{C}_n(k)), \quad (163)$$

where we define the function

$$\tilde{g}(x^n | \mathcal{C}_n(k)) := \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} \frac{1}{M} g(x^n | W^n(m, k)) \quad (164)$$

with

$$\mathcal{C}_n(k) := \{W^n(m, k) : m \in \mathcal{M}_n\} \quad (165)$$

and

$$g(x^n | w^n) := \frac{1}{\widehat{Q}_{X^n}(x^n)} P_{X^n|W^n}(x^n | w^n). \quad (166)$$

Then for  $w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_W)$  and  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X)$ ,

$$g(x^n | w^n) = \frac{\frac{Q_{X^n|W^n}^n(x^n|w^n) \mathbf{1}\{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|w^n)\}}{Q_{X^n|W^n}^n(\mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|w^n)|w^n)}}{\frac{Q_{X^n}^n(x^n)}{Q_{X^n}^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)})}} \quad (167)$$

$$\leq \frac{Q_{X^n}^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}) \mathbf{1}\{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|w^n)\}}{p_n} \times e^{n \sum_{w,x} T_{w^n x^n}(w,x) \log \frac{Q(x|w)}{Q(x)}} \quad (168)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{p_n} e^{n(1+4\epsilon)I_Q(W;X)} \quad (169)$$

$$=: \beta_n, \quad (170)$$

where  $p_n := \min_{w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_W)} Q_{X^n|W^n}^n(\mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|w^n)|w^n)$  converges to one exponentially fast as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ , and (169) follows from the typical average lemma [22].

Continuing (163), we get for any sequence  $\delta_n > 0$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( \min_{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}, k \in [1:e^{nR_0}]} \tilde{g}(x^n | \mathcal{C}_n(k)) \leq 1 - \delta_n \right) \\ & \leq \left| \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)} \right| e^{nR_0} \max_{\substack{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}, \\ k \in [1:e^{nR_0}]}} \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n}(\tilde{g}(x^n | \mathcal{C}_n(k)) \leq 1 - \delta_n), \end{aligned} \quad (171)$$

where (171) follows from the union bound. Obviously,  $\left| \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)} \right| e^{nR_0}$  is only exponentially large. Therefore, if the probability vanishes doubly exponentially fast, then  $\min_{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}, k \in [1:e^{nR_0}]} \tilde{g}(x^n | \mathcal{C}_n(k)) > 1 - \delta_n$  with probability at least  $1 - \gamma_n$ , where  $\gamma_n \rightarrow 0$  doubly exponentially fast as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . Next we prove this.

Observe that given  $x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X)$ ,  $k \in [1 : e^{nR_0}]$ , the quantities  $g(x^n | W^n(m, k))$ ,  $m \in \mathcal{M}_n$  are i.i.d. random variables with mean and variance bounded as follows.

$$\mu_n := \mathbb{E}_{W^n} [g(x^n | W^n)] \quad (172)$$

$$\begin{aligned} &= \sum_{w^n} \frac{Q_W^n(w^n) \mathbf{1}\{w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_W)\}}{Q_W^n(\mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_W))} \\ & \quad \times \frac{Q_{X^n|W^n}^n(x^n|w^n) \mathbf{1}\{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|w^n)\}}{Q_{X^n|W^n}^n(\mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|w^n)|w^n)} \\ & \quad \times \frac{Q_{X^n}^n(x^n) \mathbf{1}\{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X)\}}{Q_{X^n}^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X))} \end{aligned} \quad (173)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \geq Q_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X)) \sum_{w^n} Q_{W^n|X^n}^n(w^n | x^n) \\ & \quad \times \mathbf{1}\{w^n \in \mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_W), x^n \in \mathcal{T}_{4\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|w^n)\} \end{aligned} \quad (174)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \geq Q_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X)) \sum_{w^n} Q_{W^n|X^n}^n(w^n | x^n) \\ & \quad \times \mathbf{1}\{(w^n, x^n) \in \mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX})\} \end{aligned} \quad (175)$$

$$\rightarrow 1 \text{ exponentially fast as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (176)$$

where (176) follows since both  $Q_X^n(\mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}(Q_X))$  and

$$q_n := \min_{x^n \in \mathcal{T}_\epsilon^{(n)}} Q_{W^n|X^n}^n(\mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_{WX}|x^n)|x^n) \quad (177)$$

converge to one (from below) exponentially fast as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ . In the other direction,

$$\mu_n \leq \sum_{w^n} \frac{1}{Q_W^n(\mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_W)) p_n} \frac{Q_W^n(w^n) Q_{X^n|W^n}^n(x^n|w^n)}{Q_{X^n}^n(x^n)} \quad (178)$$

$$= \frac{1}{Q_W^n(\mathcal{T}_{2\epsilon}^{(n)}(Q_W)) p_n} \quad (179)$$

$$\rightarrow 1 \text{ exponentially fast as } n \rightarrow \infty, \quad (180)$$

and

$$\text{Var}_{W^n} [g(x^n | W^n)] \leq \mathbb{E}_{W^n} [g(x^n | W^n)^2] \leq \beta_n \mu_n. \quad (181)$$

We set  $\delta_n := e^{-n\gamma}$ , where  $\gamma > 0$  is smaller than the exponent of the convergence in (176). Hence  $\delta_n + \mu_n - 1 > 0$  for sufficiently large  $n$  and  $\delta_n + \mu_n - 1$  converges to zero (from above) exponentially fast with the exponent  $\gamma$ . Then for sufficiently large  $n$ , we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n}(\tilde{g}(x^n | \mathcal{C}_n(k)) \leq 1 - \delta_n) \\ &= \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} g(x^n | W^n(m, k)) - \mu_n M \right. \\ & \quad \left. \leq (1 - \delta_n - \mu_n) M \right) \\ & \leq \mathbb{P}_{\mathcal{C}_n} \left( \left| \sum_{m \in \mathcal{M}_n} g(x^n | W^n(m, k)) - \mu_n M \right| \right) \end{aligned} \quad (182)$$

$$\geq (\delta_n + \mu_n - 1) M \Big) \quad (183)$$

$$\leq 2 \exp \left( - \frac{\frac{1}{2} (\delta_n + \mu_n - 1)^2 M^2}{M \beta_n \mu_n + \frac{1}{3} (\delta_n + \mu_n - 1) M \beta_n} \right) \quad (184)$$

$$\leq 2 \exp \left( - \frac{3 (\delta_n + \mu_n - 1)^2 M}{2 (\delta_n + 4 \mu_n - 1) \beta_n} \right), \quad (185)$$

where (184) follows from Bernstein's inequality [34].

Observe that  $\delta_n + \mu_n - 1 \rightarrow 0$  exponentially fast with exponent  $\gamma$ , and

$$\frac{M}{\beta_n} = p_n e^{n(R - (1+4\epsilon)I_Q(W;X))} \rightarrow \infty \quad (186)$$

exponentially fast with the exponent  $R - (1 + 4\epsilon) I_Q(W; X)$ . Hence (185) converges to zero doubly exponentially fast as long as  $R > (1 + 4\epsilon) I_Q(W; X) + 2\gamma$ . Since  $\epsilon, \gamma > 0$  are arbitrary, such a convergence result holds as long as  $R > I_Q(W; X)$ .

### B. Converse

Since  $X^n \rightarrow (W_n, K_n) \rightarrow Y^n$  and  $(X^n, Y^n) \sim \pi_{XY}^n$ , a synthesis code forms an exact common information code [7] if we consider  $(W_n, K_n)$  as a common random variable. The following converse for exact common information problem has been proven in [7, Appendix A-C].

**Lemma 5.** [7, Appendix A-C] *For a sequence of random triples  $\{(X^n, Y^n, Z_n)\}$  such that  $(X^n, Y^n) \sim \pi_{XY}^n$  and  $X^n \rightarrow Z_n \rightarrow Y^n$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{n} H(Z_n) &\geq -\frac{1}{n} H(X^n Y^n | Z_n) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_z P_{Z_n}(z) \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X^n|Z_n=z}, P_{Y^n|Z_n=z} \| \pi_{XY}^n) + o(1) \end{aligned} \quad (187)$$

where  $o(1)$  denotes a term that vanishes as  $n \rightarrow \infty$ .

By the lemma above, we have

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 + R &\geq -\frac{1}{n} H(X^n Y^n | W) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_w P(w) \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X^n|W=w}, P_{Y^n|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}^n), \end{aligned} \quad (188)$$

where  $W := (W_n, K_n)$ .

On the other hand,

$$R \geq \frac{1}{n} H(W_n | K_n) \quad (189)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n} I(X^n; W_n | K_n) \quad (190)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} I(X^n; W_n K_n) \quad (191)$$

where (191) follows since  $X^n$  is independent of  $K_n$ .

## APPENDIX D PROOF OF THEOREM 2

The inner bound has been proved in Appendix C-A. On the other hand,  $\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$  follows from the

following argument. By the definition of the maximal cross-entropy of couplings, we have

$$\sum_w P(w) \mathcal{H}(P_{X^n|W=w}, P_{Y^n|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}^n) \geq n H_\pi(XY), \quad (192)$$

we have  $\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}^n) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}^n)$ . Cuff [3] showed that  $\frac{1}{n} \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}^n) = \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY})$ . Hence by using the multi-letter characterization in Theorem 1, we have

$$\mathcal{R}_{\text{Exact}}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \mathcal{R}_{\text{Cuff}}(\pi_{XY}). \quad (193)$$

Hence we only need to prove the outer bound  $\mathcal{R}^{(o)}(\pi_{XY})$ .

Denote  $J \sim P_J := \text{Unif}[1 : n]$  as a time index independent of  $(W_n, K_n, X^n, Y^n)$ . Denote  $W := W_n K_n J X^{J-1} Y^{J-1}$ ,  $X := X_J$ ,  $Y := Y_J$ . Since  $X^n \rightarrow W_n K_n \rightarrow Y^n$  and  $(X^n, Y^n) \sim \pi_{XY}^n$ , a channel synthesis code is also an exact common information code [7]. The multi-letter expression of the sum-rate in  $\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}^n)$  is lower bounded by the following single-letter expression.

**Lemma 6.** [7, Theorem 2] *For a sequence of random triples  $\{(X^n, Y^n, Z_n)\}$  such that  $(X^n, Y^n) \sim \pi_{XY}^n$  and  $X^n \rightarrow Z_n \rightarrow Y^n$ , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{1}{n} H(X^n Y^n | Z_n) + \frac{1}{n} \sum_z P_{Z_n}(z) \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X^n|Z_n=z}, P_{Y^n|Z_n=z} \| \pi_{XY}^n) \\ &\geq -H(XY|W) + \min_{Q_{WW'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_W, P_{W'})} \sum_{w, w'} Q_{WW'}(w, w') \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'} \| \pi_{XY}). \end{aligned} \quad (194)$$

where  $W := Z_n J X^{J-1} Y^{J-1}$ ,  $X := X_J$ ,  $Y := Y_J$ , and  $J \sim P_J := \text{Unif}[1 : n]$  denotes a random time index independent of  $(Z_n, X^n, Y^n)$ .

By the lemma above, the multi-letter expression of the sum rate in  $\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}^n)$  can be lower bounded as

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 + R &\geq -H(XY|W) \\ &\quad + \min_{Q_{WW'} \in \mathcal{C}(P_W, P_{W'})} \sum_{w, w'} Q_{WW'}(w, w') \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w'} \| \pi_{XY}). \end{aligned} \quad (195)$$

On the other hand, observe that

$$\begin{aligned} &P_{W_n K_n X^i Y^{i-1}} \\ &= P_{W_n K_n} P_{X^i | W_n K_n} P_{Y^{i-1} | W_n K_n} \end{aligned} \quad (196)$$

$$= P_{W_n K_n} P_{X^{i-1} | W_n K_n} P_{X_i | W_n K_n X^{i-1}} P_{Y^{i-1} | W_n K_n}. \quad (197)$$

Hence  $X_i \rightarrow W_n K_n X^{i-1} \rightarrow Y^{i-1}$  forms a Markov chain.

We then get

$$R \geq \frac{1}{n} H(W_n | K_n) \quad (198)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{n} I(X^n; W_n | K_n) \quad (199)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} I(X^n; W_n K_n) \quad (200)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; W_n K_n | X^{i-1}) \quad (201)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; X^{i-1} W_n K_n) \quad (202)$$

$$= \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n I(X_i; X^{i-1} Y^{i-1} W_n K_n) \quad (203)$$

$$= I(X_J; X^{J-1} Y^{J-1} W_n K_n | J) \quad (204)$$

$$= I(X_J; X^{J-1} Y^{J-1} W_n K_n J) \quad (205)$$

$$= I(X; W), \quad (206)$$

where (203) follows since  $X_i \rightarrow W_n K_n X^{i-1} \rightarrow Y^{i-1}$  forms a Markov chain.

#### APPENDIX E PROOF OF THEOREM 3

**Inner Bound:** Set  $X = W \oplus A$  and  $Y = W \oplus B$  with  $W \sim \text{Bern}(\frac{1}{2})$ ,  $A \sim \text{Bern}(a)$ , and  $B \sim \text{Bern}(b)$  mutually independent, where  $b := \frac{p-a}{1-2a}$ ,  $a \in (0, p)$ . That is,  $a\bar{b} + \bar{a}b = p$ . Since by the assumption  $p < \frac{1}{2}$ , we have  $a, b < \frac{1}{2}$ . From Example 1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}) \\ = \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + (a+b) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (207)$$

Hence we have

$$\mathcal{R}(\pi_{XY}) \subseteq \left\{ \begin{array}{l} (R, R_0) \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^2 : a \in (0, p), b := \frac{p-a}{1-2a}, \\ R \geq 1 - H_2(a), \\ R_0 + R \geq -H_2(a) - H_2(b) \\ \quad + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + (a+b) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \end{array} \right\}. \quad (208)$$

**Outer Bound:** We adopt similar techniques as the ones used by Wyner [9]. Denote

$$\alpha(w) := \mathbb{P}(X = 0 | W = w) \quad (209)$$

$$\beta(w) := \mathbb{P}(Y = 0 | W = w). \quad (210)$$

Hence  $P_{XY} = \pi_{XY}$  implies

$$\mathbb{E}\alpha(W) = \mathbb{P}(X = 0) = \frac{1}{2} \quad (211)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\beta(W) = \mathbb{P}(Y = 0) = \frac{1}{2} \quad (212)$$

$$\mathbb{E}\alpha(W)\beta(W) = \mathbb{P}(X = 0, Y = 0) = \alpha_0. \quad (213)$$

From Example 1, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}(P_{X|W=w}, P_{Y|W=w} \| \pi_{XY}) \\ = \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + \min\{\alpha(w) + \beta(w'), \overline{\alpha(w)} + \overline{\beta(w')}\} \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \end{aligned} \quad (214)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \geq \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + \left( \min\{\alpha(w), \overline{\alpha(w)}\} + \min\{\beta(w'), \overline{\beta(w')}\} \right) \\ \times \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}. \end{aligned} \quad (215)$$

Define  $\alpha'(W) := |\alpha(W) - \frac{1}{2}|$ ,  $\beta'(W) := |\beta(W) - \frac{1}{2}|$ ,  $\delta(W) := \alpha'^2(W)$ ,  $\gamma(W) := \beta'^2(W)$ ,  $a := \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)}$ , and  $b := \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\gamma(W)}$ . Then we have that

$$\begin{aligned} R_0 + R \\ \geq -\mathbb{E}H_2(\alpha(W)) - \mathbb{E}H_2(\beta(W)) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \\ + \left( \mathbb{E} \min\{\alpha(W), \overline{\alpha(W)}\} + \mathbb{E} \min\{\beta(W), \overline{\beta(W)}\} \right) \\ \times \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \end{aligned} \quad (216)$$

$$\begin{aligned} = -\mathbb{E}H_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha'(W)\right) - \mathbb{E}H_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \beta'(W)\right) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \\ + \left( \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \alpha'(W)\right) + \mathbb{E}\left(\frac{1}{2} - \beta'(W)\right) \right) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \end{aligned} \quad (217)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \geq -H_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)}\right) - H_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\gamma(W)}\right) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} \\ + \left(\frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)} + \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\gamma(W)}\right) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0} \end{aligned} \quad (218)$$

$$= -H_2(a) - H_2(b) + \log \frac{1}{\alpha_0} + (a+b) \log \frac{\alpha_0}{\beta_0}, \quad (219)$$

where (218) follows from the fact both  $x \mapsto H_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{x}\right)$  for  $x \in [0, \frac{1}{4}]$  and  $x \mapsto \sqrt{x}$  for  $x \geq 0$  are concave functions [9, Prop. 3.3]. Similarly,

$$R \geq I(W; X) \quad (220)$$

$$= 1 - \mathbb{E}H_2(\alpha(W)) \quad (221)$$

$$= 1 - \mathbb{E}H_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \alpha'(W)\right) \quad (222)$$

$$\geq 1 - H_2\left(\frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)}\right) \quad (223)$$

$$= 1 - H_2(a). \quad (224)$$

On the other hand,

$$\begin{aligned} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} \mathbb{E}\alpha(W) = \frac{1}{2} \\ \mathbb{E}\beta(W) = \frac{1}{2} \\ \mathbb{E}\alpha(W)\beta(W) = \alpha_0 \end{cases} \\ \Rightarrow \begin{cases} 0 \leq \alpha'(w), \beta'(w) \leq \frac{1}{2} \\ \mathbb{E}\alpha'(W)\beta'(W) \geq \alpha_0 - \frac{1}{4} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (225)$$

$$\Rightarrow \begin{cases} 0 \leq \delta(W), \gamma(W) \leq \frac{1}{4} \\ \mathbb{E}\sqrt{\delta(W)}\sqrt{\gamma(W)} \geq \alpha_0 - \frac{1}{4} \end{cases} \quad (226)$$

$$\Rightarrow a\bar{b} + \bar{a}b \leq p, \quad (227)$$

where (227) follows since by the Cauchy–Schwarz inequality, we have

$$a\bar{b} + \bar{a}b = a + b - 2ab \quad (228)$$

$$= 1 - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\gamma(W)} - \left( \frac{1}{2} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)} - \sqrt{\mathbb{E}\gamma(W)} + 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)}\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\gamma(W)} \right) \quad (229)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} - 2\sqrt{\mathbb{E}\delta(W)\mathbb{E}\gamma(W)} \quad (230)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{2} - 2\mathbb{E}\sqrt{\delta(W)\gamma(W)} \quad (231)$$

$$\leq p. \quad (232)$$

Combining (219), (224), and (227) yields the desired result.

### Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the Associate Editor Prof. Amin Gohari and the three reviewers for their extensive, constructive and helpful feedback to improve the manuscript.

### REFERENCES

- [1] C. H. Bennett, P. W. Shor, J. A. Smolin, and A. V. Thapliyal. Entanglement-assisted capacity of a quantum channel and the reverse Shannon theorem. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 48(10):2637–2655, 2002.
- [2] A. Winter. Compression of sources of probability distributions and density operators. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0208131*, 2002.
- [3] P. Cuff. Distributed channel synthesis. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 59(11):7071–7096, 2013.
- [4] C. H. Bennett, I. Devetak, A. W. Harrow, P. W. Shor, and A. Winter. The quantum reverse Shannon theorem and resource tradeoffs for simulating quantum channels. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 60(5):2926–2959, 2014.
- [5] P. Harsha, R. Jain, D. McAllester, and J. Radhakrishnan. The communication complexity of correlation. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 56(1):438–449, 2010.
- [6] C. T. Li and A. El Gamal. Strong functional representation lemma and applications to coding theorems. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 64(11):6967–6978, 2018.
- [7] L. Yu and V. Y. F. Tan. On exact and  $\infty$ -Rényi common informations. *arXiv preprint 1810.00295*, 2018.
- [8] G. R. Kumar, C. T. Li, and A. El Gamal. Exact common information. In *IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 161–165. IEEE, 2014.
- [9] A. Wyner. The common information of two dependent random variables. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 21(2):163–179, 1975.
- [10] L. Yu and V. Y. F. Tan. Wyner’s common information under Rényi divergence measures. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 64(5):3616–3632, 2018.
- [11] L. Yu and V. Y. F. Tan. Corrections to “Wyner’s common information under Rényi divergence measures”. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.02534*, 2018.
- [12] Y. Steinberg and S. Verdú. Channel simulation and coding with side information. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 40(3):634–646, 1994.
- [13] M. H. Yassaee, A. Gohari, and M. R. Aref. Channel simulation via interactive communications. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 61(6):2964–2982, 2015.
- [14] F. Haddadpour, M. H. Yassaee, S. Beigi, A. Gohari, and M. R. Aref. Simulation of a channel with another channel. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 63(5):2659–2677, 2017.
- [15] T. S. Cubitt, D. Leung, W. Matthews, and A. Winter. Zero-error channel capacity and simulation assisted by non-local correlations. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 57(8):5509–5523, 2011.
- [16] E. Nummelin. Uniform and ratio limit theorems for markov renewal and semi-regenerative processes on a general state space. In *Annales de l’IHP Probabilités et statistiques*, volume 14, pages 119–143, 1978.
- [17] K. B. Athreya and P. Ney. A new approach to the limit theory of recurrent markov chains. *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society*, 245:493–501, 1978.
- [18] G. O. Roberts and J. S. Rosenthal. General state space markov chains and mcmc algorithms. *Probability Surveys*, 1:20–71, 2004.
- [19] S.-W. Ho and S. Verdú. On the interplay between conditional entropy and error probability. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 56(12):5930–5942, 2010.
- [20] B. N. Vellambi and J. Kliewer. Sufficient conditions for the equality of exact and Wyner common information. In *Communication, Control, and Computing (Allerton), 2016 54th Annual Allerton Conference on*, pages 370–377. IEEE, 2016.
- [21] C. T. Li and A. El Gamal. Distributed simulation of continuous random variables. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 63(10):6329–6343, 2017.
- [22] A. El Gamal and Y.-H. Kim. *Network Information Theory*. Cambridge University Press, 2011.
- [23] T. M. Cover and J. A. Thomas. *Elements of Information Theory*. Wiley-Interscience, 2nd edition, 2006.
- [24] S. W. Ho and R. W. Yeung. On information divergence measures and a unified typicality. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 56(12):5893–5905, 2010.
- [25] S. W. Ho. Markov lemma for countable alphabets. In *Information Theory Proceedings (ISIT), 2010 IEEE International Symposium on*, pages 1448–1452. IEEE, 2010.
- [26] S. T. Rachev and L. Rüschendorf. *Mass Transportation Problems: Volume I: Theory*, volume 1. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [27] L. Yu and V. Y. F. Tan. Rényi resolvability and its applications to the wiretap channel. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 65(3):1862–1897, 2019.
- [28] B. N. Vellambi and J. Kliewer. New results on the equality of exact and Wyner common information rates. In *2018 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pages 151–155. IEEE, 2018.
- [29] P. Cuff, H. Permuter, and T. Cover. Coordination capacity. *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory*, 56(9):4181–4206, 2010.
- [30] G. Xu, W. Liu, and B. Chen. Wyner’s common information: Generalizations and a new lossy source coding interpretation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1301.2237*, 2013.
- [31] L. Yu, H. Li, and C. W. Chen. Generalized common informations: Measuring commonness by the conditional maximal correlation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1610.09289*, 2016.
- [32] M. Loeve. Elementary probability theory. In *Probability Theory I*, pages 1–52. Springer, 1977.
- [33] H. Cramér. *Mathematical methods of statistics (PMS-9)*, volume 9. Princeton University Press, 2016.
- [34] S. Boucheron, G. Lugosi, and P. Massart. *Concentration inequalities: A nonasymptotic theory of independence*. Oxford University Press, 2013.

**Lei Yu** received the B.E. and Ph.D. degrees, both in electronic engineering, from University of Science and Technology of China (USTC) in 2010 and 2015, respectively. From 2015 to 2017, he was a postdoctoral researcher at the Department of Electronic Engineering and Information Science (EEIS), USTC. Currently, he is a research fellow at the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, National University of Singapore. His research interests lie in the intersection of information theory, probability theory, and combinatorics.

**Vincent Y. F. Tan** (S’07-M’11-SM’15) was born in Singapore in 1981. He is currently a Dean’s Chair Associate Professor in the Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering and the Department of Mathematics at the National University of Singapore (NUS). He received the B.A. and M.Eng. degrees in Electrical and Information Sciences from Cambridge University in 2005 and the Ph.D. degree in Electrical Engineering and Computer Science (EECS) from the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in 2011. His research interests include information theory, machine learning, and statistical signal processing. Dr. Tan received the MIT EECS Jin-Au Kong outstanding doctoral thesis prize in 2011, the NUS Young Investigator Award in 2014, the NUS Engineering Young Researcher Award in 2018, and the Singapore National Research Foundation (NRF) Fellowship (Class of 2018). He is also an IEEE Information Theory Society Distinguished Lecturer for 2018/9. He has authored a research monograph on “Asymptotic Estimates in Information Theory with Non-Vanishing Error Probabilities” in the Foundations and Trends in Communications and Information Theory Series (NOW Publishers). He is currently serving as an Associate Editor of the IEEE Transactions on Signal Processing.